21779

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE | THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* Terrance Ronald Carson

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* A Preliminary Development of An Approach To Teaching the Historical Process To Secondary School Students Through A Case Study.

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* University of Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* M.Ed.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ* Fall, 1974

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Dr. D.F. Kellum

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* August 9/74 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ*

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXE*
458 - 5 Ohio Drive,
Stephenville, Newfoundland.

NL-91 (11-73)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT OF AN APPROACH TO TEACHING THE HISTORICAL PROCESS TO SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS THROUGH A CASE STUDY

by

TERRANCE RONALD CARSON

©

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1974

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled A PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT OF AN APPROACH TO TEACHING THE HISTORICAL PROCESS TO SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS THROUGH A CASE STUDY submitted by Terrance Ronald Carson in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

..........D.J. Kellum..........
Supervisor

....

....

Date ...July 24, 1974.....

ABSTRACT

In recent years the study of history as a discipline has been declining in importance as a component of the secondary school social studies curriculum. While examination of the outcomes which are intended from the teaching of history seems to indicate that it should still occupy a place of prominence, several studies have indicated that there is a lack of congruency between these intended outcomes and the actual outcomes. Such a discrepancy suggests a problem of instruction.

An analysis of criticisms of history instruction suggests that much current history instruction aims at the communication of the conclusions of historical inquiry rather than the processes by which these products are formed. It is hypothesized in this study that the discrepancy between the desired potential outcomes and the actual outcomes of history instruction would be reduced if the processes of historical inquiry were incorporated in an instructional method. Toward this end, therefore, an instructional plan was developed based upon teaching the elements of historical inquiry using a case study problem approach - in this instance, of the circumstances surrounding the death of the princes in the Tower and the alleged implication of Richard III.

The elements of historical inquiry used in the development of this instructional plan were derived from writings by historians on their craft. These elements were submitted to a panel of six faculty members of the Department of History at the University of Alberta and twelve Edmonton secondary school teachers, with majors in history, for validation. The instructional plan intended to teach these elements of the historian's method of inquiry was then submitted to a judgmental panel of experienced secondary social studies teachers for formative evaluation. This panel, consisting of seven social studies graduate students in the Department of Secondary Education at the University of Alberta and ten practising social studies teachers in the Edmonton area, was asked to evaluate the instructional plan on the basis of its teachability and the congruency between its objectives and the proposed strategies.

The judgmental panel generally agreed that the instructional plan, as submitted to them, was both teachable and possessed internal congruency between strategies and objectives. Some reservations which the panel had regarding the teachability of the plan were taken under advisement for future reference when implementing plan as a unit of study in the classroom.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There were many individuals who made valuable contributions to the development, exploration and completion of this study. As thesis supervisor, Dr. D.F. Kellum provided ready advice and encouragement at all stages of this study. To him I extend my sincerest appreciation. I would also like to thank the thesis committee members, Dr. T. Aoki and Dr. J.M. Kirman for their helpful suggestions and discussion.

I would also like to extend my appreciation to Dr. H. Kass for her assistance in formulating the design of this study.

I am grateful to those faculty members of the Department of History at the University of Alberta who showed such a great interest in this study and so willingly discussed the historian's inquiry procedures. In addition I would also like to thank the teachers in the Edmonton and area schools who were able to take time to either discuss the historical method or make judgments regarding the instructional plan.

A debt of gratitude is owed to my fellow social studies graduate students in 201, who contributed so much to the ideas that went into this thesis.

Thanks is due to Mrs. Kay Coward for her expert and efficient work in typing this thesis.

Finally I would like to thank my wife, Rillah, for her consistent encouragement, support and understanding during the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. PROBLEM, DESIGN OF STUDY AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED.............. 1
Introduction.......................... 1
Need for the Study...................... 1
Purpose of the Study.................... 4
Assumptions............................ 4
Design of the Study..................... 5
Definitions of Terms Used............... 8
Limitations of the Study................ 9
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE................ 12
The Use of History...................... 12
Content-Oriented History Teaching...... 16
Critique of Content-Oriented History Teaching..................... 18
Process-Oriented History Teaching...... 23
Critique of Process-Oriented History Teaching..................... 25
Process As Content...................... 27
III. DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN.... 28
Introduction.......................... 28
Discussion of Responses of Teachers and Historians to Historical Method Questionnaire................. 30
Validated Elements of the Historical Elements of the Historical Method to be Used in the Instructional Plan........................ 49

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. A CASE STUDY INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN TO TEACH THE ELEMENTS OF HISTORICAL INQUIRY TO A GRADE 10 LEVEL HISTORY CLASS.............................. 52

Introduction and Rationale for Selection of Case Study Topic......... 52

The Instructional Plan................. 55

V. FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN................................ 84

Introduction.......................... 84

Congruency of the Planned Strategies with the Objectives of the Unit.................................. 86

Assessment of the Teachability of the Instructional Plan................ 96

VI. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH......... 110

Summary............................... 110

Recommendations for Implementation of the Instructional Plan............ 113

Conclusions and Implications........... 120

Recommendations for Further Research............................ 127

BIBLIOGRAPHY.................................. 130

APPENDICES.................................... 135

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Teachers' and Historians' Responses to Statements Regarding the Objectives of the Historical Method........... 33

II. Teachers' and Historians' Responses to Statements Regarding the Process of Locating a Historical Problem.......... 35

III. Teachers' and Historians' Responses to Statements Regarding the Historian's Development of a Hypothesis......... 37

IV. Teachers' and Historians' Responses to Statements Regarding the Historian's Procedures for Gathering Source Material......................... 40

V. Teachers' and Historians' Responses to Statements Regarding the Historian's Criticism of Source Materials....... 43

VI. Teachers' and Historians' Responses to Statements Regarding the Historian's Synthesis of Validated Historical Data.............................. 47

VII. Judges' Ratings Regarding the Congruency of Instructional Plan's Proposed Strategies with Objectives......... 87

VIII. Judges' Impressionistic Ratings of the Teachability of the Instructional Plan.................................. 96

IX. Mean Impressionistic Ratings of Graduate Students to Statements Concerning the Internal Congruency and the Teachability of the Instructional Plan.................................. 99

X. Mean Impressionistic Ratings of Teachers to Statements Concerning the Internal Congruency and the Teachability of the Instructional Plan................ 100

CHAPTER I

PROBLEM, DESIGN OF STUDY AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

I. INTRODUCTION

A discipline offers a special way of looking at phenomena, in its methods of inquiry, its procedures for utilizing research, and its models for systematic thought (Parker and Rubin, 1966, p. 22). Since History has its own particular perspective and procedures, it may be counted as a discipline (Collingwood, 1946; Nevins, 1962). Nevertheless, the recent decline of history as a separate course of study in North American schools (Eisenberg, 1971) (Sellers, 1969) seems to raise the question of the continuing relevance of the discipline's value and the effectiveness of its method of instruction in realizing this value.

II. NEED FOR THE STUDY

Le Roi B. Daniels (1971, p. 3) contends that curricula are commonly justified by appeal to contributive, instrumental, or inherent values. Claims have been variously made for the inclusion of history in the curriculum for one or another of these three reasons. The following are some of the claims for history's value as applied to

Daniel's taxonomy of classification. Charles Beard (1932, p. 20) has seen history as having a paramount contributive value in "furnishing the cement to bind all other social disciplines into a workable unity". Edwin Fenton and his colleagues at the Carnegie-Mellon Institute have claimed that the historian's method is an useful instrument to develop "independent and critical thinking skills" in secondary school students (Good, 1968, p. 9). G.R. Elton has claimed that history inherently fosters a growth in the maturity of a young person by expanding his experience (Elton, 1970, pp. 226-227).

Professional literature supports the value of history in achieving certain curricular aims. Some recent studies interestingly have thrown into question the effectiveness of current instructional methodologies in realizing this value. A.B. Hodgetts (1968, pp. 68-70) noted that in well over 75% of the 847 classrooms observed in the National History Project critical thinking and reading skills received no attention or inadequate treatment in the opinion of the investigators. In most cases he cited teacher-centred, textbook-bound classroom procedures as being responsible. [illegible] "low-level knowledge" which is communicated and often quickly forgotten (Hodgetts, 1968, pp. 70-72) casts doubt on the claim that history's inherent value of contributing to the student's maturity is actually being achieved in the classroom. It is also clear that the instrumental value to be derived from history might be lost in the "gray consensus version of the textbook, oblivious to the controversy, the viewpoints and the alternatives of all those in history who would have done things differently (Hodgetts, 1968, p. 24)". One might also ask what the contributive value of history to other learnings might be if 'textbook generalities and discrete, unpatterned facts 'learned by rote' [and] soon forgotten (Hodgetts, 1968, p. 70)" are the order in the majority of history classrooms in Canada.

Further opinion and emipirical evidence (Fenton, 1971; Rojas, 1972; Commager, 1965; Hodgetts, 1968) suggests that the instructional methodologies that are practised in many history classrooms are not congruent with the anticipated outcomes of such instruction, as expressed by some of the selected justifications for history being taught.

Postman and Weingartner (1969), Parker and Rubin (1966) and Jerome Bruner (1960) among many others have suggested that the belief that many of the diverse learning products assumed of a certain content, which go far beyond the direct elements taught, is an invalid assumption. They have argued that learning objectives should be directly attended to, because transfer is never assured and is never automatic.

III. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study will be to develop and validate an instructional plan, based upon the case study approach, to teach the elements of historical inquiry to secondary school students, following the principle enunciated by Bruner (1960) and Parker and Rubin (1966) that process in a discipline lends order and the ability to transfer content to new situations. Specifically the following questions will be explored with respect to and in conjunction with the development of such a method of history instruction:

1. What is the rationale for teaching history as a separate course of study in the secondary school, ie. in what ways is it claimed to benefit the learner?
2. To what extent does the content-oriented approach to history instruction attend to the needs of the learner which are claimed as a rationale for the teaching of history?
3. How may process-centred instruction proposed in this study minimize any existing discrepancy between the rationale for teaching history and existing instructional methodology?

IV. ASSUMPTIONS

This study is predicated upon the following assumptions:

1. The assumption that the process of history will enable the learner to increase his understanding of, and his capacity for criticizing historical writing.

2. The assumption that the case study selected for the instructional plan will employ procedures applicable to other historical questions.
3. The assumption that both historians and teachers, who have Bachelors of Arts degrees in history, will be able to identify significant elements of historical method.
4. The assumption that historians will have a better knowledge of historical method than will teachers holding a Bachelor of Arts degree in history.
5. The assumption that ten secondary social studies teachers, selected because of the interest they expressed in the teaching of history from Edmonton and district secondary schools are representative of the population of practising social studies teachers in this area.

V. DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Developing the Instructional Plan

It is proposed in this study to develop an instructional plan for teaching the historical method to secondary school students. Such an instructional plan will address itself to the rationale for teaching history as explicated in the literature. Because there appears to be a close relationship between the goals of the spirit and letter of historical scholarship and the rationale for teaching history in schools, it is proposed to base this instructional plan on the structure of inquiry in the discipline.

Validating the Historical Method

The specifics of the historical method to be followed in constructing this instructional plan will be drawn up as a set of statements. These statements will be submitted to six faculty members of the Department of History at the University of Alberta in order to validate this historical method. The six respondents will be asked to react to each of the statements to indicate their agreement/disagreement with respect to their validity as interpretations of aspects of the historical method. The same set of statements will be submitted to twelve Edmonton secondary school social studies teachers, selected on the basis of their having academic majors in history, in order to test for congruency between teacher/historian perceptions of the selected aspects of the historical method. In instances of disagreement the historians interpretation will be accepted.

The validated historical method will then be used to construct a case study historical problem to be used as the instructional plan.

Rationale for Case Study Approach

A case study approach will be used in the proposed instructional plan in order to apply a historical method of inquiry to a particular historical problem. The case study approach is used because it will enable the learner to focus his attention on a particular, representative historical problem permitting the use of the historical method. The purpose of selecting a particular historical problem to explicate historical method is clearly stated by R.G. Collingwood. Historical inquiry, Collingwood argues, is not a process of arranging known data in this or that kind of pattern, it consists of fastening upon something we do not know about the past and trying to discover it (1946, p. 9). Resolution of the problem, or at least greater insight towards its resolution, will come with efforts to discover past actuality (Lucey, 1958, p. 18; Krug, 1967, p. 3). The proposed instructional plan will lead the students through the following steps of historical inquiry:

1) Introduction to a historical problem through contact with representative conflicting interpretations.
2) Selection and compilation of relevant data from initial research.
3) Construction of an initial hypothesis to guide research.
4) Further research, selection and interpretation of data as to its reliability using the process of internal and external validation of evidence.
5) Progressively refining the hypothesis through the rejection and validation of evidence.

6) Leading to a defensible interpretation of what, as nearly as possible, represents past actuality.

VI. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Case study - an intensive study of a limited situation, assuming that examination of such a limited incident will employ procedures and/or yield conclusions applicable to a more general class of incidents.

Content - A compendium of information, which may consist of a related body of facts, laws, theories, generalizations, description of events or any other predetermined arrangement of a particular segment of man's knowledge (Parker and Rubin, 1966, p. 1).

Curriculum - the selection and structuring of cultural knowledge to be translated into individual learnings.

Historical Method - a procedure used by historians essentially for the purpose of interpreting evidence. This procedure generally involves selecting and gathering evidence related to a particular problem of the past, subjecting this evidence to tests of validation and synthesizing the evidence into a defensible interpretation of the historical problem.

History - is an interpretation of man's past based upon an incomplete and selective record of past events.

Instruction - a set of procedures which include the selection of content and the employment of strategies thought to be instrumental in realizing the intended outcomes of a curriculum.

Process - Refers to all the random or ordered operations which can be associated with knowledge and with human activities (Parker and Rubin, 1966, p. 2).

VII. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The focus of this study is essentially on developing an instructional plan which is anchored in a firm theoretical foundation. As such no extensive formative or summative evaluation, based upon field testing of the unit in the classroom, is planned. Rather a preliminary formative evaluation of the instructional plan will rest upon the expert opinion and predictive capabilities of experienced teachers who are either presently teaching or engaged in graduate work. The researcher is cognisant of certain limitations inherent in such an evaluation design.

Firstly, the ratings assigned by a judge as to the teachability of the instructional plan assumes a close congruency between the predictions of successful classroom performance by an experienced teacher and an actual successful performance in a real classroom situation. The researcher was unable to locate empirical evidence to directly support such an assumption, although some research, notably Keddie (1970) and Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968), has indicated that teacher prediction of pupil performance is a determinant of their success.

Secondly, the judges will be asked to rate how well the plan performs on criteria which apply to congruency and teachability. The ratings will be placed on a summated rating, Likert-type scale. This design of the judgmental instrument is subject to the differential tendency of individuals to use a certain type of response (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 496). Therefore, the fact that differing responses among the judges on a particular item may either represent truly varying judgments or a differential tendency of individuals to use a certain type of response, is recognized as a limitation of this design. This limitation is somewhat mitigated, however, by allowing the respondent to supplement his rating response by written commentary.

A third limitation is occasioned by the small number of practising social studies teachers and graduate students being asked to evaluate the instructional plan. With such a small sample, ratings given by a single respondent, become considerably more significant in influencing an overall judgment of plan than they would using a larger sample. The fact that the idiosyncracies of a particular individual may significantly influence the overall results of the judgmental evaluation is recognized as a limitation in this study.

A fourth limitation, also occasioned by the sample, is the fact that the practising teachers being asked to rate the instructional plan are drawn from Edmonton and district secondary schools. These ratings are limited, therefore, to this particular population of secondary school social studies teachers. This limitation is somewhat mitigated by some of the graduate students having had out of province teaching experience in the social studies.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

I. THE USE OF HISTORY

Instruction in history, as a separate course of study in the secondary school, has been declining in North American schools (Eisenberg, 1971; Rojas, 1972). This has been a cause for concern among some historians (Sellers, 1969), but it need not necessarily be a cause for concern amongst secondary school educators. The issue for the educator is whether or not history instruction characteristically enhances knowledge, skills and attitudes in the learner which are both valuable and uniquely, or at least most appropriately, available through such instruction. If history instruction can be shown to fulfill these needs of the learner, then its decline should be a cause for disquiet, because something of value is then being lost from the curriculum.

Justification of Curricula

Le Roi B. Daniels (1971) has provided a useful taxonomy for the justification of curricula which may be used here to classify and organize statements concerning the value of history. Curricula, he asserts, are commonly justified by appeal to one or more of three accounts.

Firstly, a curriculum may be justified because it has contributive value, that is it is valuable because it produces experiences which contribute to further understandings and deeper learnings in other fields (p. 9). Secondly, it may be justified on the basis of its instrumental value, in that the curriculum is claimed to produce a condition, other than itself, which is considered to be of value (p. 9). The third justification suggested by Daniels is an appeal to the inherent value of curriculum, that is; that it typically produces in people experiences which have intrinsic value.

The Contributive Value of History Instruction

Charles Beard has argued that the value of history in relation to the other social sciences is basically contributive.

> History can furnish the cement to bind all other social disciplines into a workable unity, giving to them a patterned background and, by virtue of its basic time element, a dynamic which pertains to the future... (Beard, 1932, p. 20)

The Instrumental Value of History Instruction

The utilization of the study of a particular discipline or disciplines to produce a condition considered to be of value has been the usual justification of curricula. Many educators have seen history as having a particular instrumental value. One might argue that, in the end, most study of history is beneficial, hence it has an instrumental value. For the purposes of this study, however, only those writers who advocate the practice of extracting a part of historical study from the whole in order to produce a condition considered to be of value will be regarded as proponents of history for its instrumental value.

The proponents of the inquiry process in social studies have drawn heavily upon the historical method in developing inquiry techniques. Fenton (Good, 1968) utilizes his interpretation of the historical method in order to "help the student to develop into an independent thinker and a responsible citizen" (p. 9). Cox and Massialas (1966) view the contribution of history to the study of man as lying "in the provision of testable insights and [only to] a lesser extent in the provision of evidential data and case studies usable in testing hypotheses" (p. 39).

The Inherent Value of History Instruction

Something may be judged to be of inherent value if it typically produces in people experiences which are intrinsically good (Daniels, 1971, p. 9). There is a considerable agreement of opinion among historians and educators alike, that history typically produces an enlarged experience of life and that such experience is beneficial. The satisfaction of enormously extending our perspective and experience through a study of the past contributes to one of the elements which Henry James thought essential to the life of the mind - a sense of the past (Commager, 1965, p. 74). Professor G.R. Elton (1970) notes that such experience of life in the past is needed by young people in order to grow in maturity. Historical study, he argues, will help to overcome näive notions such as a simple solution to a complex problem and a universal ascription on one's own needs and perceptions which are borne from a lack of such maturity (pp. 226-227).

Experiences drawn from a study of history offer other benefits in addition to aiding in the development of maturity. Paul Ward (1971) notes that in studying the past, both events which parallel today's and events which are unique will emerge. By studying these parallel events objectively, objectivity may also be brought to bear on present-day controversial issues. He argues that history is superior to the other social sciences towards this end in that it is able to combine an expression of human complexity with objectivity. He claims that this dimension of human complexity is very often missing from the "bloodless, abstract treatment of social scientific problems (p. 59)."

Appeal to the pleasurable experiences produced by history has often been presented by many writers as a justification for its inclusion in the curriculum. George Macaulay Trevelyan (1913) argued that few readers will study history because they think it is their patriotic duty, or because they want to improve their minds. They will, rather, choose books which will interest and delight them (p. 14). Henry Steele Commager (1965) likewise admits no *à priori* functional purpose for history beyond the generally enriching experiences it produces. It is, he reports, of use only in the sense that music, poetry, flowers, religion and philosophy are useful, that is, "without it life would be much poorer and meaner (p. 73)."

Conclusions

The above statements provide a considerable weight of opinion in favour of the value of instruction in history. Charles Beard (1932) and others have remarked that history has a contributive value to the "on the whole" unity of the social studies. It has been claimed by some writers to be instrumental in providing the learner with critical thinking and reading skills necessary in the creation of responsible citizens. Finally history has been encouraged as a study which creates intrinsically valuable experiences such as enjoyment, personal enrichment and generally increased maturity.

II. CONTENT-ORIENTED HISTORY TEACHING

History teaching in Canada (Hodgetts, 1968), the United States (Palmer, 1967) as well as in much of the rest of the world (McNeill, 1970) has been characteristically oriented towards teaching the products of the historian's inquiry into the past. This traditional tendency to value the interpretations and conclusions of history as opposed to the process by which these are arrived at is more often implied then explicitly stated.

Such an implication is present in John Trueman's (1968) concern with the fact that "it will be quite possible for a student to graduate from the Ontario school system completely ignorant of any civilization but that of modern Western Europe (or its North American offshoots) (p. 31)". Or his similar reservation that the "hit-and-miss approach [to curriculum development] bodes ill for the traditional history, a history which, for all its faults, offered a coherent body of knowledge along with a reasonable broad coverage (p. 31)".

George Macaulay Trevelyan's history-as-literature refutation (1913) of the then commonly-held von Ranke tradition that history was a science, reflects a similar preoccupation with the products of historical inquiry.

> The motive of history is at bottom poetic. The patient scholar, wearing out his life in scientific historical research, and the reader more idly turning the pages of history, are both enthralled by the mystery of time, by the mutuality of all things, by the succession of the ages and generations (1969, p. 60).

Less often expressed are statements of explicit preference for content-oriented, as opposed to process-oriented, teaching methodologies. G.R. Elton (1970) the eminent Cambridge historian, has eloquently supported this position in his recommendations concerning the kind of history which should be taught in British schools. He argues that teaching the process of history is "most obviously useful for those who least need to be kept at work on history" (p. 224). In addition it is his opinion that,

> ... an interest in this manner of studying history can be very limiting, ... one of the most striking things about even good students in their early days at university is their inability to think at all largely, to see things in perspective, their ignorance of so much history and their lack of any articulated cultural background (p. 224).

To rectify this problem that he has seen at the university level, Professor Elton has suggested that history can be usefully employed at the school level to help remedy this kind of näivete and promote a broader perspective. He suggests that this may be best accomplished by studying a wide range of historical topics spanning human experiences through time; topics, such as medieval history, quite removed from the preoccupations of the present (pp. 226-227).

III. CRITIQUE OF CONTENT-ORIENTED HISTORY TEACHING

While content-centred instruction has, perhaps, been the most common orientation of history textbooks and secondary school history classrooms, recent criticism has cast some doubt on the efficacy of this instructional orientation in realizing the justifications for history being included in the curriculum.

Survey Textbooks

It may be assumed here that if "content is a rhetoric of conclusions to be transferred to the student (Schwab, 1961, p. 19)", then "coverage" of a breadth of material is an important goal of content-oriented instruction. For this reason the textbook, which provides an interpretation and makes conclusions on a wide variety of topics has been a common vehicle for displaying this content (Hodgetts, 1968, pp. 21-22).

Fenton and others, who have lauded the historical method as developing critical reading and thinking skills, have found little to support their claim in textbooks which "hide all but the conclusions of the hypotheses and assumptions about the nature of the reality which govern the interpretations historians make (Palmer, 1967, p. 143)." Fenton notes that the single all-encompassing textbook militates against the student being faced with conflicting interpretations which he must resolve (Fenton, 1971, p. 29). Robert Livingston Schuyler has suggested the following discrepancy developing between the realization of his instrumental value of history and the outcomes of instructional strategy using the survey textbook:

> ... historians whose fortune it has been to be widely read ... have been fond of making incursions into the realm of historical philosophy, and their readers, accepting them as reliable reporters of the past, often fail to distinguish between their facts and their interpretations. The historical notions that are conveyed by "great" historians ... get diffused by a host of lesser luminaries, and find

> their way through textbooks into schools, where they are usually taught uncritically and absorbed unquestionly by the youth of the land (Schuyler, 1932, p. 5).

Doubts concerning the intrinsically interesting experiences which may be derived from history displayed in survey textbooks, have been raised by several historians and educators. Dr. Nicholas Wickenden, a member of the University of Alberta History Department and a past participant on several provincial curriculum committees, has characterized survey textbook history as "dull history (Wickenden, 1967, p. 1)". It is dull, he reports, because writers of such textbooks must resort to vague generalizations to cover a broad sweep of time. Edwin Fenton, continuing in a similar vein, argues that the textbook treatment of history, being filled with abstractions and generalizations, becomes "stripped of exceptions, larded with 'important' names and dates, devoid of individual people, devoid of life and colour and passion [leaving it] homogenized, antiseptic and dull (Fenton, 1971, p. 9).

John R. Palmer, in a review of five recently published secondary school American history textbooks, has noted and further criticized their apparent failure to realize the intrinsic value of the experiences which may be provided by history. He questions the likelihood of students drawing parallels between the past and present problems because the writers of textbooks fail to encourage it (1967, p. 138).

Constraints on Instructional Methodology

Fenton (1971) points out that survey textbooks, reducing history to a series of generalities, necessarily constrain instructional methodology by encouraging expository teaching by lecture and recitation (p. 29). In addition to this tendency to limit the range of teaching practice, it has also been argued that such instruction is based upon questionable psychological premises. Carl Rodgers is of the opinion that content-oriented survey courses are based upon "the false assumption that what is taught is learned; what is presented is assimilated (Rojas, 1972, p. 120)".

Such criticism casts further doubt on the ability of history, organized for instruction along content lines, to expand the experience of the learner. Failure to do so results in a failure to realize the inherent value claimed for history by such writers as Elton.

Influences on Learning

Although much history instruction focuses on content, such an orientation does not entirely preclude process. Dr. Gerald Walsh (1967), surveying the philosophies of history in Canadian high school texts, has observed that many of these texts present their views tentatively (p. 13). In so doing they inform their readers that the textbook represents an interpretation of history by a few historians and that other interpretations are possible. Their readers are further informed that these interpretations are often made on the basis of fragmentary information about the past.

James Shaver has questioned the assumption that such a transfer of learning takes in this manner.

> I doubt that anyone learns to think like Schlesinger, by reading The Age of Roosevelt. There seems to be an assumption that if we teach children the substantive concepts of a discipline they will learn to be analytical, and I would question whether this assumption is valid. (In Morrissett, 1967, p. 42)

Shaver's opinion is powerfully supported by the communication theory enunciated by McLuhan. If the medium is indeed the message, then content does not exist independently of the medium by which it is presented. This means that the most important content of any learning experience is the method or process through which the learning occurs. This, according to Parker and Rubin (1966) is "the crux of the assumed contradiction between content and process (p. 2)".

> Where primary emphasis is upon content, the learner ordinarily functions in the passive mode. He conditions himself to submit to authority. He accepts the proffered gospel, and he neither selects his conclusions nor assesses their validity. He does not wear a tailor-made mind, but a ready-made one, cut in the fashion of the day. Even here he employs a number of processes-directed toward the springing-up of bookishness and to its consequent exhibition in the preferred manner. (Parker and Rubin, 1966, p. 2).

Conclusions

It is apparent from the literature that content-oriented instruction in history obviates some of the valuable experiences which are claimed to emanate from a study of the discipline. The problem seems to centre on the lack of congruence between the content that is to be transmitted and its method of transmission. In short, it is the practise of viewing history as content to be "covered" without regard for the process by which it is presented that many educators and historians apparently find reprehensible.

IV. PROCESS-ORIENTED HISTORY TEACHING

Many educators became sensitized to the process dimension of learning with the publication of Jerome Bruner's The Process of Education in 1960. In this book he argued that transfer of the most powerful form of knowledge, the knowledge of attitudes and principles, is dependent upon the mastery of the structure of the subject matter (Bruner, 1960, p. 18). He urged, therefore, that curriculum be designed that is true to the underlying structure of its subject matter and matched to the capacities of students of different abilities at different grades in school (pp. 18-19). Bruner's learning theories formed the underlying psychological rationale for many of the national curriculum projects of the late 1960's in the United States.

The growing realization that substantive knowledge in almost all fields, and particularly in science, was expanding too rapidly to be assimilated, provided powerful impetus for the shift toward process-oriented curricula. Schwab expressed this conviction as follows:

> [The] best possible selection of the most useful bits and pieces from the content of the disciplines would constitute, today, only one portion of the

> curriculum we need ... [W]ithout some understanding of [the] structures, the learning of conclusions, of content, becomes mislearning and misunderstanding (Schwab, 1961, p. 37).

Process In History

Since 1960 many books of readings, containing source materials for history students in secondary schools have been published, most of which are suitable for inductive teaching. In addition, in the United States two major history curriculum projects aimed at producing process-oriented materials and developing instructional techniques for secondary schools began work in the early 1960's (Fenton, 1966, pp. 432-433).

The Amherst Project or The Committee on the Study of History was begun in 1961 with the intention of bringing teachers and professional historians together to produce process-oriented materials. Once produced, these materials were inserted into existing secondary school history courses in order to "transform these courses from within (Brown, 1970, p. 74)".

The influence of Bruner's theories are readily apparent in the structure and underlying rationale of the Amherst Project. The "best minds in [the] particular discipline (Bruner, 1960, p. 19)" were put to work on the task and the curriculum was developed around the structure of history. It was intended that students, by acquiring knowledge of the structure of the discipline, would discover their own answers to historical problems.

A second major history curriculum project, developing process-oriented instructional materials, was centred at the Carnegie-Mellon Institute of Technology under the direction of Dr. Edwin Fenton. Fenton and his associates developed numerous curricular materials, including a five lesson unit designed to teach the process of the historian's form of inquiry to secondary school students (Fenton, 1966, pp. 152-176). As in the case of the Amherst Project, Fenton's work is based strongly on Bruner's learning theories.

V. CRITIQUE OF PROCESS-ORIENTED HISTORY TEACHING

One of the major sources of criticism of a process-oriented curriculum arises from concern over its seeming inefficiency. Bruner (1960), Fenton (1966), Brown (1970) and many of the other exponents of process-oriented instruction adhere either explicitly or implicitly to Dewey's admonition that people learn best through doing. That is, people learn the process best by using the process.

While agreeing with Bruner's idea that the structural concepts of each discipline can be identified and taught, David Ausabel (1962) rejects the notion that this can be best taught through an active inquiry process (p. 115). Ausubel accepts the idea that inquiry is useful for evaluating learning outcomes and for teaching problem solving techniques, but he does not believe that it is primarily useful for transmitting subject matter content, such as the structures and underlying concepts of a discipline (p. 116). This, he feels, may be accomplished more efficiently by using advanced organizers to explicate the most abstract and general concepts of a discipline and then progressively differentiating the less general subsumed concepts in that discipline. Or, alternatively Ausubel suggests that new concepts may be reconcilled with existing concepts through explicitly integrating the old with the new (Joyce and Weil, 1972, pp. 165-179).

A second criticism of process-oriented instruction generally, and of process-oriented history instruction specifically, arises from a seeming reaction of certain educators to what they perceived to be an overemphasis on content. Parker and Rubin (1966, pp. 3-4) have noted that the various proposals of discovery and inquiry learning put forward by writers such as Bruner, Suchman, Skinner, Getzels and others have exacerbated the implied dichotomy between process and content by stressing the process dimension at the expense of content.

Edwin Fenton might be criticized for so ignoring content when he employed unrelated content to teach four intimately related procedures used by historians in their study of the past; how the historian determines what is fact, how he categorizes his facts, how he developes and tests a hypothesis, and how he deals with his own mind set. It would seem that since the historian relates these procedures to the specific content that happens to be concerned with, then Fenton should have related the four procedures to be learned by the students to a single particular historical question. In this manner the process and the content would be related and not appear in dichotomy.

VI. PROCESS AS CONTENT

Parker and Rubin (1966) urge that process be conceptualized as the "life-blood of content and a point of view be adopted which holds that they cannot be a dichotomy (p. 4)". It would seem, from a review of the literature on instructional methodology, that it is only in so apprehending the content and process dimensions of history that the justifications for its inclusion in the curriculum may be realized.

CHAPTER III

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN

I. INTRODUCTION

The instructional plan developed in this study was based upon the elements of the historical method as derived from the writings of historians on the subject. Twenty elements of the historical method were extracted from this literature and then arranged in the general order of the procedures used by a historian in solving a historical problem. These elements were then submitted to a panel of six historians from the Department of History at the University of Alberta and twelve secondary school teachers, with majors in history, who were teaching in Edmonton city schools. The questionnaire was constructed using a summated rating scale which allowed each respondent the opportunity of registering an agree/disagree response to each particular item. In addition, space was provided after each for the respondent to either qualify or elaborate upon the response he selected. A copy of this questionnaire on the historical method is found in Appendix A.

Rationale for Organization of Questionnaire Items

For the purposes of this study each of the twenty statements regarding some aspect of the historical method was appropriately footnoted and arranged in the general order of the historian's inquiry process. These twenty statements on the historian's process were classified into the six following categories:

a) Objectives of the historical method
b) Locating a historical problem
c) Developing a hypothesis
d) Gathering source materials (evidence)
e) Criticizing source materials (evidence)
f) Synthesis of validated historical data

A review of the literature on the historian's method clearly indicates general agreement by historians themselves on the order of the procedures they employ in their inquiry. Prior to discussing the actual procedures of the historian in The Idea of History, Collingwood (1946) began with a statement regarding the object of the discipline (p. 9). Allan Nevins in The Gateway to History (1962) and Mark Krug in History and the Social Sciences (1967) also began their discussions on the historian's method with a statement of its objectives. It would seem, therefore, that an analysis of a methodology of inquiry should begin first with what that inquiry is for.

Collingwood (1946) has noted that since history is a kind of research or inquiry, it begins by fastening upon something we do not know, and trying to discover it (p. 9). The historian, in trying to answer the question which has been posed in the problem, endeavours to do so through interpretation of evidence (Collingwood, p. 10). To guide and order his search for evidence, the historian develops a hypothesis (Nevins, 1962, p. 238) either consciously or unconsciously (Berkhofer, 1969). This hypothesis is reformed, redefined and, at times, totally discarded by the historian as he proceeds with his research (Nevins, p. 243).

The historian interprets evidence using certain principles of historical criticism. Historical criticism has often been classified in terms of external (questions applying generally to the origins of the evidence) and internal (questions dealing with the consistency and believability of the evidence itself) criticism (Lucey, 1958; Barzun and Graff, 1957). The criticism of evidence enables the historian to test the validity of his hypothesis and eventually refine it into the form of a synthesis of validated evidence, which provides a defensible explanation of the problem (Krug, 12, 1967).

II. DISCUSSION OF RESPONSES OF TEACHERS AND HISTORIANS TO HISTORICAL METHOD QUESTIONNAIRE

The responses of the teachers and the historians to the individual statements on the historical method indicated that these respondents generally agreed that each of these twenty statements constituted elements of the historian's inquiry. The fact that historians and teachers often focused on different aspects of the historical method, as well as actually disagreeing on certain points, implies that there is a need to further examine the extent to which the historical method is actually taught by the historians in their college-level classes. One might hypothesize that this lack of consensus between historians and teachers stems from the fact that historians tend to teach history's conclusions rather than a method for arriving at these conclusions. It might be revealing to question the historians further as to their intended student outcomes for the teaching of history as well as their feelings on the relative importance of process and content in the teaching of history.

Although the historians generally concurred with the statements in the questionnaire, some objected to the implied (mechanical) precision of the procedure. These historians agreed that while problem solving was an important part of the historian's technique, it was not the same as mathematical or scientific problem solving. Historical problem solving, they argued, involves a "feeling" or "empathy" with the subject matter in addition to the processes of hypothesizing, researching, criticizing and synthesizing data. Reference was made by one of these historians to Collingwood's distinction between the "inside" and the "outside" of an event (1946, pp. 213-217). Collingwood asserts that knowing the "inside" of an event - what a person's thoughts were that made him do a certain thing - is as important as knowing what happened. It is understanding the "inside" of an event that enables the historian to develop this "feeling" and this "empathy".

This historian has made a significant point, a point which is worthy of consideration when explicating any process of human inquiry. Clearly individual differences in thinking contribute to individual insights born of imagination and intuition. These, unavoidably tend to be ignored when that inquiry process is abstracted and generalized as an intellectual construct.

Analysis and Detailed Discussion of Individual Statements

Before indicating the elements of the historical method which will be used as guidelines to be followed in constructing the instructional plan, the responses of the historians and the teachers to the individual statements on the questionnaire will be discussed in detail.

Objectives of the Historical Method

Both the historians and the teachers were generally agreed on the objectives and focus of the historical method that were suggested in the questionnaire - the discovery of past actuality, focusing on a unique event or series of events. The historians pointed out, however, that they are able to, and do, make certain assumptions about human behaviour through experience gained by studying these unique events.

The responses of the two groups regarding the objectives of the historical method are depicted in Table I which is followed by a discussion of the responses to each individual statement.

TABLE I

TEACHERS' AND HISTORIANS' RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS REGARDING THE OBJECTIVES OF THE HISTORICAL METHOD

Statement		Agree	Disagree	No Response
1	Historians	6	0	0
1	Teachers	12	0	0
1	Percentage	100%	0%	0%
2	Historians	5	1	0
2	Teachers	9	2	1
2	Percentage	77.8%	16.7%	5.5%

1. Although a past event may never be perfectly reconstructed, the goal of the historian is to try to discover, as nearly as possible, past actuality. (Collingwood, p. 5; Krug, p. 12)

There was complete agreement from all respondents on this item. One historian remarked that it is equally important to discover "the potential of a historical situation", for example, what the alternatives were for the actors.

2. The focus of historical, as opposed to other types of social scientific inquiry, is upon the interpretation of an unique event or series of events, rather than the formulation of generalizations regarding human behaviour (Trevelyan, p. 62).

There was general agreement by both historians and teachers on this point. Most respondents (5 historians and 5 teachers) qualified their statements.

The historians generally agreed that, while historical inquiry concerned itself with unique events, knowledge of the particular will enable one to make generalizations. As one historian noted, the general and the unique are not mutually exclusive categories. A second qualification added by three historians stated that the historian will make certain general assumptions regarding human behaviour, but he should make these assumptions explicit.

Some teachers agreed that it was difficult for the historian not to make certain assumptions about human behaviour. Two other teachers indicated their agreement with the statement and added that historians provide data for other social sciences to make generalizations.

Locating A Historical Problem

The process of locating an area requiring further historical inquiry seemed to be of more concern to historians than to teachers. There appeared to be a conviction among several historians that the relationship of a problem to contemporary institutions, movements, or issues was of some importance in determining what should be studied in history. Both teachers and historians agreed that secondary source material was useful in providing the background for historical inquiry.

The responses of the two groups regarding the task of locating a historical problem are depicted in tabular form below. A discussion of the responses to the two individual statements concerning this aspect of the historical method follows Table II.

TABLE II

TEACHERS' AND HISTORIANS' RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS REGARDING THE PROCESS OF LOCATING A HISTORICAL PROBLEM

Statement		Agree	Disagree	No Response
1	Historians	4	2	0
1	Teachers	11	1	0
1	Percentage	83.3%	16.7%	0%
2	Historians	6	0	0
2	Teachers	12	0	0
2	Percentage	100%	0%	0%

1. Historical inquiry begins when some event, development or experience in the past is questioned, either as a result of new data coming to light or through a reinterpretation of old data. From a general feeling of difficulty with the problem, the historian isolates the crucial points that give rise to his initial doubts (Collingwood, p. 9).

One historian disagreed with the statement because he preferred the word "revive" rather than the term "begin" in the statement. Two historians noted that questions regarding history usually arise from questions about current problems, origins of contemporary institutions or other present concerns which may be better understood through inquiry into the past.

The teachers generally commented less on this statement than did the historians. One cautioned against accepting historical "fact" and the second teacher who commented, stated that he felt uncomfortable with the assertion without knowing why.

2. Secondary source material often serves to acquaint the uninitiated historian with the major theoretical issues in a particular area of history (Elton, p. 66).

The historians all agreed with the statement without comment.

Five teachers offered comments. One stated that secondary source material would be very "confusing" to the student. The other four comments were largely amplifications of the statement noting that secondary material would be easier than primary sources for the secondary school student to understand.

Developing A Hypothesis

The role of the hypothesis again seemed to be of greater concern to historians than to teachers. Although the historians agreed on the role of the hypothesis in history, there was some disagreement as to how and when it is actually formulated. It would seem, however, that the hypothesis, according to the historians, is gradually formulated and refined over much of the period of research. It was also the view of two of the historians that a single hypothesis does not necessarily lead to an oversimplified answer to a historical problem.

The responses of the historians and the teachers to each of the two statements dealing with how the historian develops a hypothesis are summarized in Table III. A detailed discussion of these responses to each statement will follow the table.

TABLE III

TEACHERS' AND HISTORIANS' RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS REGARDING THE HISTORIAN'S DEVELOPMENT OF A HYPOTHESIS

Statement		Agree	Disagree	No Response
1	Historians	5	1	0
1	Teachers	11	1	0
1	Percentage	88.9%	11.1%	0%
2	Historians	4	2	0
2	Teachers	12	0	0
2	Percentage	88.9%	11.1%	0%

1. After defining the problem and carrying out preliminary research, the historian develops a hypothesis (tentative conclusion) which he seeks to prove or disprove through more extensive research. (Nevins, p. 234)

The historian's comments generally showed them to be more concerned about this aspect of historical inquiry than were the teachers. Three commented on this statement. Two qualified their agreement with the assertion, because they felt that it implied that this aspect of the inquiry process was a "mechanical" procedure. The only dissenting historian suggested that a historian always begins with a hypothesis, regardless of whether or not he is aware of it.

The one teacher who expressed disagreement did so because he felt the historian's "peripheral view" of other possible explanations would be limited by developing a hypothesis.

2. In developing a hypothesis the historian recognizes that ready acceptance of one single hypothesis tends to lead to an oversimplified answer to a historical problem (Nevins, p. 243).

Three historians commented on this point. The two dissenting historians disagreed not so much with the statement itself, but with the fact that it left out a class of contrary occurrences. They pointed out that a single hypothesis might conceivably adequately explain a historical problem. The third historian, who agreed with the statement, again felt that the procedure was not as "mechanical" as the assertion implied.

This aspect of the historical method elicited only one comment from a teacher. This was by way of an amplification noting that the historian refined his hypothesis during the time of research.

Gathering Source Material

There were some interesting variances of opinion between the historians and the teachers in the area of gathering and criticizing source materials. The historians generally accepted that in gathering source material, they first, check the availability of data, then look into secondary sources for beginning research and seek information from the closest witnesses to a past event. Many teachers seemed to doubt part of this procedure. They questioned that the historian would actually check the availability of data before beginning extensive inquiry.

The responses of the two groups regarding the historian's procedures for gathering source materials are displayed in tabular form on the following page. A detailed discussion of each of the three statements dealing with this aspect of the historian's method follows after Table IV.

TABLE IV

TEACHERS' AND HISTORIANS' RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS REGARDING THE HISTORIAN'S PROCEDURES FOR GATHERING SOURCE MATERIALS

Statement		Agree	Disagree	No Response
1	Historians	5	1	0
1	Teachers	7	4	1
1	Percentage	66.7%	27.8%	5.5%
2	Historians	5	1	0
2	Teachers	11	1	0
2	Percentage	88.9%	11.1%	0%
3	Historians	6	0	0
3	Teachers	12	0	0
3	Percentage	100%	0%	0%

1. Before proceeding with extensive inquiry into a problem, the historian checks the availability of data (Barzun and Graff, p. 23; Lucey, p. 22).

There seemed to be an interesting divergence of opinion between historians and teachers on this point. One might hypothesize that the historians had less difficulty accepting this statement because they have had more experience with actual research. The only dissenting historian argued that the researcher usually "blunders" on data, rather than conducting an extensive, orderly inquiry into the availability of sources.

Six teachers commented on the statement. Two felt that if the historian always checked the availability of data first, then little new research would be done. Three other teachers seemed to be unclear as to what data a historian works with. One remarked that this was so, because he had never attempted any intensive research himself.

2. Generally speaking, the historian endeavours to seek evidence from the closest witness to a past event (primary sources) in order to minimize distortion of past reality (Nevins, p. 195).

All historians generally agreed that the historical researcher endeavours to seek evidence from the closest witness to a past event. One historian registered disagreement with the statement noting Bloch's distinction between "intentional" and "unintentional" evidence. Another historian qualified his agreement by stating that testimony in the form of memoirs may distort evidence.

Three teachers commented on the statement. One was by way of an amplification, the other two noted that the historian must be aware of the possible bias of such a source.

3. Well-documented secondary source material often serves to introduce the historian to available primary source material (Clark, p. 128).

All the respondents agreed with this statement without further comment.

Criticizing Source Materials

The historians were in almost complete agreement with the elements of historical criticism outlined in the questionnaire. While this aspect of the historical method occasioned little comment from historians, some points were questioned and even hotly debated by the teachers. The most obvious instance of this occurred in connection with the statement regarding contemporary opinion being used to judge an observer's competency. Many teachers focused upon exceptions to this rule, pointing out that an observer can be wrongly judged by his contemporaries.

The responses of the historians and the teachers concerning the historian's criticism of source materials during the course of his inquiry, are displayed in Table V. The following is a discussion of the reaction of the individual respondents to each of the statements.

1. Detecting whether a document contains unintentional errors or is a deliberate deception is an essential part of a historian's work (Bloch, p. 62).

All the historians agreed on this point without qualification. One teacher disagreed with the statement, because he doubted that this type of rigorous checking was very important to the average citizen or amateur historian.

2. The historian generally questions the origin of his source materials before establishing the meaning and trustworthiness of the data itself (Elton, p. 74).

All of the historians agreed on this point without qualification. One teacher felt that the historian might look at the content of the material before examining the source. He did agree that, in the final analysis,

TABLE V

TEACHERS' AND HISTORIANS' RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS REGARDING THE HISTORIAN'S CRITICISM OF SOURCE MATERIALS

Statement		Agree	Disagree	No Response
1	Historian	6	0	0
1	Teachers	11	1	0
1	Percentage	94.5%	5.5%	0%
2	Historian	6	0	0
2	Teachers	11	0	1
2	Percentage	94.5%	0%	5.5%
3	Historian	5	0	1
3	Teachers	12	0	0
3	Percentage	94.5%	0%	5.5%
4	Historians	6	0	0
4	Teachers	11	1	0
4	Percentage	94.5%	5.5%	0%
5	Historians	6	0	0
5	Teachers	8	4	0
5	Percentage	77.8%	22.2%	0%
6	Historian	6	0	0
6	Teachers	10	2	0
6	Percentage	88.9%	11.1%	0%
7	Historians	5	0	1
7	Teachers	10	2	0
7	Percentage	83.3%	11.1%	5.5%
8	Historians	6	0	0
8	Teachers	12	0	0
8	Percentage	100%	0%	0%

the external validity of the source was probably more important in determining the document's overall validity.

3. A report or story regarding a particular historical event, which appears a long time after the occurence, should be validated against evidence given at the time of the event (Nevins, p. 224).

All of the historians generally agreed with the substance of this statement, but two qualified their assent by pointing out that this was not always possible, although it was desirable. Another historian pointed out that it was extremely important in oral history to validate recollected evidence against contemporary evidence.

All teachers agreed with the statement, although one, again noted that only serious, professional historians would bother doing this.

4. A historian attempts to ascertain how familiar the author of a source is with the event he reports, *ie*. did his information come from direct observation, hearsay, borrowed source materials, *etc*. (Nevins, p. 195).

All the historians agreed with the statement, but one noted that it would apply only to narrative sources.

One teacher indicated disagreement, arguing that the statement covered only a marginal point of the historical method.

5. The historian endeavours to discover whether or not an author of a source was considered to be a competent observer by his contemporaries in order to evaluate the worth of that document as a piece of evidence (Nevins, p. 197).

This statement presented a second interesting point of contrast between the responses of the historians and the responses of the teachers. All historians agreed with the point without qualification. Five teachers, three disagreeing and two agreeing, pointed out that it is often the case that an observer, maligned and mistrusted by his contemporaries, will turn out to be "right" in the end. One teacher went as far as to state that no one could adequately judge the competence of an observer. Another teacher noted that a "weltgeist" might limit the perspective of many observers at a particular time, while the supposed "incompetent" observer may see beyond this screen.

6. The historian attempts to uncover the motivation behind the production of a certain document in evaluating the worth of that document as a piece of evidence (Elton, p. 69).

All of the historians agreed that such information was important. One stated that, in his opinion, this was the most important aspect of criticism. Another noted that this was a very subtle operation.

Although two teachers disagreed with the statement, only one made written comments. This teacher seemed to mistake primary source documents for the writing of secondary source materials, stating that the "enforced" publication of historical writing for professional advancement is a factor in criticism.

7. Accounts of the same event by two independent and competent observers are sought after by historians in order to verify the testimony given by a particular observer (Nevins, p. 225).

Five historians agreed without qualification with this point. The sixth historian withheld opinion, because he felt two independent and competent observers would be difficult to find.

The wording of the statement troubled three teachers (one agreeing and two disagreeing). They all noted that more than two independent and competent observers would be better than just two.

8. A historian attempts to interpret the meaning of a primary source with reference to the then contemporary ideals and concepts. He realizes that the imposition of modern ideals and concepts on the past may cause him to misinterpret the intent of that source (Acton, p. 65; Schuyler, p. 15).

All the respondents agreed with this statement. One teacher noted that, in his opinion, the new Alberta Social Studies Programme was ignoring this point with its emphasis on the "shallow value-making process".

Synthesis of Validated Historical Data

The procedure of synthesizing historical data, like the process of hypothesizing, seemed to be another area of some disagreement among the historians. It was argued, both by the teachers and by the historians, that the hypothesis may be proven or disproven during synthesis. Both noted that in attempting to prove his hypothesis, the historian cannot afford to ignore any valid data.

The responses of the historians and the teachers to the procedures used by the historians to synthesize the validated evidence into a defensible treatment of a historical problem are displayed in tabular form below. A discussion of the two group's reactions to the three statements dealing with this aspect of the historical method follows Table VI.

TABLE VI

TEACHERS' AND HISTORIANS' RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS REGARDING THE HISTORIAN'S SYNTHESIS OF OF VALIDATED HISTORICAL DATA

Statement		Agree	Disagree	No Response
1	Historians	4	2	0
1	Teachers	10	2	0
1	Percentage	77.8%	22.2%	0%
2	Historians	5	1	0
2	Teachers	9	2	1
2	Percentage	77.8%	16.7%	5.5%
3	Historians	5	1	0
3	Teachers	11	1	0
3	Percentage	88.9%	11.1%	0%

1. After the historian gathers and criticizes his data, he refers to his hypothesis and determines what information would be significant in proving the hypothesis (Nevins, p. 238).

Two historians disagreed with the statement arguing that evidence which both proves and disproves his hypothesis needs to be considered by the historian. One historian, who agreed with the assertion, noted that the historian must indicate and justify evidence not considered.

The two dissenting teachers made the same point as the dissenting historians.

2. After he has criticized his data, the historian evaluates and rates his sources from most believable to least believable (Clark, p. 127).

The only historian who disagreed with the statement commented that he felt that this was part of the criticizing process of the historical method rather than a part of the synthesizing process.

The one teacher who disagreed stated that historian merely used the validated data and "junked" the rest. Another teacher, who agreed with the statement, argued that "only a really keen historian" would bother with this aspect of the process. The undecided respondent among the teachers did not register a reason for being unable to make a decision.

3. Once the historian has determined the significance and the credibility of his sources, he proceeds to reconstruct the historical event (Krug, p. 12).

In this case the only dissenting historian did so because he felt the process identified in this statement gradually developed throughout the entire inquiry. He also stated that he felt generally uncomfortable about this "machine-like" representation of the historian's process.

The one dissenting teacher argued that the past may only be reinterpreted rather than reconstructed. History, he asserted, is not a science.

III. VALIDATED ELEMENTS OF THE HISTORICAL METHOD TO BE USED IN THE INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN

The responses of the historians and the teachers to the elements of the historical method suggested in the questionnaire, provided the guidelines for the processes of historical inquiry intended to be taught by the instructional plan developed in this study. These guidelines are as follows:

1) The objective of the historical inquiry in the instructional plan should be to try to discover, as nearly as possible, what actually happened in the past.

2) The focus of the historical inquiry in the instructional plan should be on a particular event or series of events.

3) The historical inquiry in the instructional plan should centre on an unsolved problem of the past, preferably a problem which merits some contemporary relevance.

4) Secondary source material should be introduced near the beginning of the instructional plan, which will introduce the students to the major unsolved elements of the historical problem.

5) Secondary source material should be introduced in the instructional plan which will help to familiarize

the students with the temporal context, or the "spirit of the times" of the period under study.

6) Provision should be made in the instructional plan for the student to develop a hypothesis or tentative defensible explanation of the historical problem. Testing this hypothesis will guide further research into the problem.

7) Before embarking on extensive research into the historical problem, the student should survey the amount of literary resources available on the topic.

8) The student should discover, in the process of examining evidence in connection with the historical problem, some of the following principles of historical criticism:

   a) The historian generally questions the origin of his source materials before establishing the meaning and the trustworthiness of the data.

   b) The historian attempts to determine the intent behind the authorship of a particular report or document.

   c) The historian attempts to ascertain how familiar the author of a source is with the event he reports in judging the worth of the evidence presented by that author.

   d) Opinions given by an observer's contemporaries as to the competence of that individual as an observer, is a guideline often followed by a historian in validating certain pieces of evidence.

   e) The historian attempts to validate recollected testimony, where possible, by comparing it with testimony given at the time of the event.

f) Where possible, the historian also attempts to corroborate pieces of evidence from various sources concerning the same event.

g) When confronted with errors of fact in historical documents, the historian attempts to determine if these errors are unintentional or a deliberate fabrication of evidence.

h) The historian attempts to interpret past events and documents in terms of the ideals and concepts of the past, recognizing that an attempt to impose modern ideals and concepts on the past might distort our understanding of them.

9) The instructional plan should make provision for other principles of historical criticism, other than those suggested above, should they be appropriate for inquiry in the particular historical problem under consideration.

10) The final stage of research into the historical problem should be a process of bringing together all of the validated evidence in order to reconstruct, as nearly as possible, the historical event and the reasons for its occurence.

CHAPTER IV

A CASE STUDY INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN TO TEACH THE ELEMENTS OF HISTORICAL INQUIRY TO A GRADE 10 LEVEL HISTORY CLASS

I. INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE FOR SELECTION OF CASE STUDY TOPIC

An instructional plan for a unit was developed by the researcher. The overall purpose of the unit was to teach the preceding elements of historical inquiry to secondary school history students at about the grade X level. Adhering to Parker and Rubin's (1966) admonition that process be conceptualized as content (p. 4), the following instructional plan is structured in such a way so as to have the students employ the historian's method in solving a historical problem. By using the historian's method in an attempt to solve the case study problem, it is assumed that the students will learn the method itself.

Rationale for Selection of the Case Study Topic

The case study selected for inquiry in this instructional plan was the question of who was responsible for the death of the princes in the Tower of London. "As every schoolboy knows, villainy hath charms that never fade and as Shakespeare taught, King Richard the Third ... was the greatest villain of all" (Littleton and Rea, 1965, p. xi). This evaluation of the most infamous English monarch has been propagated by generations of history textbooks with the certainty that comes with recounting incontrovertible fact. The readers of these textbooks will, however, very likely have remained ignorant of the controversy surrounding Richard's responsibility for that heinous crime which has given rise to his villainous reputation; the murder of his two royal nephews in the Tower of London.

Serious weaknesses in the case against Richard III have occasioned some disputes among professional historians over the years (Gairdner, 1898; Markham, 1906; Kendall, 1955; Rouse, 1966), and have aroused the detective instincts of generations of curious amateurs from Horace Walpole to Josephine Tey. Many researchers who are critical of the traditional historical treatment of Richard have suspected that the textbooks' accusation of his having murdered the princes in the Tower to be Tudor propaganda, fabricated by Henry VII and his descendents in order to justify their own doubtful claims to the English throne. So strong has this feeling been that some of the most ardent opponents of this "Tudor tradition" have formed a society dedicated to rehabilitating the name of Richard III in history.

Collingwood has noted that historical inquiry begins with a problem (1946, p. 9). Clearly the question of Richard's reputation based upon his responsibility for murdering his nephews in the Tower remains very much alive as a problem in history and is, therefore, following

Collingwood's admonition, worthy of historical inquiry.

The contemporary relevance of the problem, which has been cited by some historians as being a second qualification for a topic meriting historical inquiry, is not so readily apparent in the case of Richard III and the princes. Apart from our continuing intrinsic fascination with murder and the patently obvious fact that the present British royal family might have some remote vested interest in the maintenance of the Tudor tradition, one would be taxed to defend the specifics of this case on the grounds of contemporary relevance. The instrumental value of an inquiry into this particular historical question may be justified, however, in two ways. Firstly, the historian is constantly faced with the task of unearthing past actuality (Collingwood, p. 5; Krug, p. 12). The question of Richard the Third's guilt in the deaths of the princes essentially revolves around this central goal of the historical method. By extension, it might be argued that if the larger questions of what truth is and how it is recognized are of importance to all those who seek knowledge, then the process of attempting to unearth truth in this historical context would be an appropriate endeavour for the classroom. A second point, related to this first justification, concerns the fact that the case of Richard III contains sufficient data to allow the student to judge conflicting evidence, construct several possible hypotheses and, in short, use the historian's method to reconstruct past actuality.

II. THE INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN

The following is the instructional plan for a unit developed to teach the historical method to secondary school history students by using the death of the princes in the Tower as a case study. The unit consists of nine inter-related lessons each designed to teach certain aspects of the historian's method. As planned, it is likely that a grade X class would spend from four to six weeks on this unit.

The three articles suggested in Lesson IV as required reading to introduce the students to the major unsolved elements of the historical problem and to the temporal context of the problem as located in Appendix B. An annotated bibliography of source materials on the problem, to be included with the unit, is located in Appendix C.

The format for the instructional plan is based on the format which is suggested by Leonard H. Clark in Teaching Social Studies in Secondary Schools: A Handbook (1973, pp. 45-48). Clark suggests that, in general, a lesson plan should contain the following components:

(1) Objectives for intended student outcomes, which should be stated specifically, although not necessarily in the form of behavioral objectives.

(2) The procedures for attaining the objectives. These activities should be specific, listed sequentially and pertain to the objectives stated for the lesson.

(3) Information concerning the subject matter under discussion.

(4) Notes on the materials to be used.

(5) An assignment which is clear, definite, of reasonable length, provides the necessary background for the students to do the assignment successfully and makes some provision for individual differences.

LESSON I

Topic: What Is History?

Objectives:

1) To establish a working definition of the term "history".
2) To introduce students to how history is written.
3) To sensitize the students to some of the possibilities for error in writing about the past.

Procedures: Students will be encouraged through a discussion of a series of examples to delimit a working definition of the term "history". The definition should include a statement to the effect that history is a study that is concerned with what man has done. It should also include the qualification that history is primarily concerned with the written records of what man has done, in order to distinguish it from archeology and other primarily non-written studies of man's past. Note should be made, however, that historians have sometimes used the evidence unearthed by the archeologist. Oral testimony and in recent years, audio tape and filmed records have also been used by historians in their search for evidence about the past.

Through a similar series of examples the students will be encouraged to identify the method used by the historian to write history; that is that the historian proceeds by interpreting evidence. The range of evidence used by the historian, for example; diaries, church records, chronicles, letters and writings by other historians, will be identified by drawing on examples given by the students and the teacher. It will be noted that much of the evidence used by the historian depends upon fallible data, for example; the human memory, interpretation of an event by biased witnesses, and hearsay testimony. The students will be asked to suggest some of the kinds of things the historian should be wary of in interpreting evidence from each of these various sources.

LESSON II

Topic: The Historian and the Detective.

Objectives:
1) To identify the goals of the detective.
2) To identity some of the methods followed by a detective in achieving these goals.
3) To draw an analogy between the objectives of the detective and the objectives of the historian.
4) To use the methods of the detective in order to introduce the methodology used by the historian.

Reading: Christie, Agatha. "The Underdog" from The Adventure of the Christmas Pudding, London: Pan Books, 1969. pp. 95-154.

Précis of Reading: This selection is chosen because it is particularly representative of the similarities between the historical method and the detective's method. The detective in "The Underdog", like a historian, is attempting to accurately reconstruct a particular event which occurred in the past, in this case a murder. The detective's reason for doing so is not only to ascertain exactly what happened, but also to discover the motivation for the crime in order to pinpoint a culprit. This objective is analogous to the historian endeavouring to understand, in Collingwood's (1946, p. 214) words, the "inside" and the "outside" of a historical event.

The procedure used by the detective has many similarities with that of the historian. He begins his inquiry when faced with a relevant problem which is in need of a solution, the wife of the murdered man claiming that the police have arrested the wrong person for the crime. The detective first familiarizes himself as fully as possible with the circumstances surrounding the murder, going over the activities of all the possible suspects and identifying all possible motives. He then proceeds to test the two conflicting hypotheses made available to him by the police as well as by the murdered man's wife. Testing the wife's hypothesis against testimony by a single observer, he temporarily rejects it. Further corroborated evidence, however, comes to light which causes him to reject the counter hypothesis proposed by the police.

The detective then revises the wife's hypothesis in a refined form and is able to look to a new source for further evidence. This evidence is corroborated by a second source and finding no significant evidence to the contrary, the detective is about to conclude that he has discovered the murderer and his motive. Before making his formal accusation, however, the detective constructs an experiment designed to test this final hypothesis. When the experiment is successful the criminal stands revealed.

Procedures: The students will be given a copy of "The Underdog" to read. The conclusion will, however, be omitted from these copies of the story. After this incomplete version of the story has been read by the students, the teacher will ask them to state who they believe the murderer to be and his motives. The students will be required to support their hypotheses with evidence from the reading.

Following a discussion on the evidence supporting the student hypotheses the teacher will ask each member of the class to write down further questions they would like to ask in order to check his hypothesis. The students will then be given the remainder of "The Underdog" in order to see the questions asked by the detective to prove the case.

LESSON III

Topic: The Princes in the Tower: Was There a Murder?

Objectives:
1) To introduce the students to some of the available empirical evidence concerning the deaths of the princes in the Tower of London.
2) To demonstrate to the students the need for further, more circumstantial, evidence to prove that the princes could have, in fact, been murdered.

Procedures: The students will be presented with two documents concerning the location and medical examination of certain bones thought to be the remains of the two young sons of Edward IV.

Document #1. "Edward V and Richard Duke of York: The Princes in the Tower of London" from Langdon-Davies, John (ed.) Richard III and the Princes in the Tower, London: Jonathan Cape Jackdaw Series, 1965.

Précis of Document #1: This document contains a selection of fourteen photographs of the alleged remains of the two princes and selected views of the Tower of London, including the room where the supposed murder took place. Two photographs of the coffin and the remains of a child, known to have died at the age of nine in 1481, are also provided to give an interesting comparative study. A brief commentary accompanying the photographs explains what has been found by way of artifacts and some of the difficulties in positively identifying them.

Document #2: "Medical Evidence Concerning the Deaths of the Princes" from Kendall, Paul Murray Richard the Third, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1955, pp. 406, 497-498.

Précis of Document #2: This document reviews the medical evidence for the murder of the princes as supplied by an examination of the bones photographically displayed in Document #1. When these remains were first discovered in 1674, they were pronounced to be those of the long missing princes and placed in a special crypt in Westminster Abbey. When the bodies were exhumed in 1933 for re-examination, this 1674 opinion was corroborated by an eminent physician and an eminent dentist. In fact these modern scientists noted that there was good medical evidence to show that the boys died of suffocation. Kendall submitted the report of the two medical men to a panel of experts in 1954. He records that there are still many uncertainties, not appreciated in 1933, brought to light by this more recent panel of experts.

Student Assignment: After examining these documents the students will be asked to prepare answers to the following questions for class discussion:

1. How many years after the supposed death of the princes were the remains discovered?
2. Point out one piece of evidence which shows, in your opinion, that the princes were murdered in 1483.

3. Point out one piece of evidence which shows, in your opinion, that there is still doubt concerning whether or not the princes were murdered at this time, or actually murdered at all.

4. Suggest an area, not connected with the archeological or medical evidence, that might be studied in order to discover more about the fate of the two princes in the Tower.

LESSON IV

Topic: Who Murdered the Princes In the Tower?

Objectives:

1) To acquaint the students with some of the political and social conditions existing in England at the time of the Wars of the Roses.

2) To acquaint the students with the fact that there are conflicting interpretations as to who was responsible for the murder of the princes in the Tower.

3) To introduce some of the major primary and secondary sources of information related to the topic of the murder of the princes in the Tower, for example; Sir Thomas More and Polydore Vergil.

a) Historical Background of the Wars of the Roses -

Reading: "England During the Wars of the Roses", Source: Littleton, Taylor and Rea, Robert F., To Prove a Villain, pp. xi - xii.

Précis of Reading: This reading provides a brief outline of British history from the death of Edward III in 1377 to the advent of Richard III to the throne in 1483. Particular emphasis is placed on the unsettled conditions existing in England during the Wars of the Roses. This will introduce the student to the atmosphere of violence and uncertainty in that age of history.

Visual Display Materials: In order to illustrate the causes of the Wars of the Roses and the major personalities involved, two types of display material will be used. To illustrate one of the major causes of the war, a geneological table of the related houses of York and Lancaster will be used in class. To familiarize the students with some of the personalities involved in the conflict, pictures of the following monarchs will be provided; Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI, Edward IV, Richard III and Henry VII.

Suggested Questions on Background to Wars of the Roses:

1) a. Who were the Lancastrian kings?
   b. What means did they use to come to the throne?

2) What justification did the House of Lancaster give for claiming the throne?

3) a. Who were the Yorkist kings?
   b. What means did they use to come to the throne?

4) What justification did the House of York give for claiming the throne?

5) In your opinion, were the Yorkists or the Lancastrians the rightful kings of England? Give reasons for your answer.

b) Position One: Richard III Is Responsible For the Murder of the Princes in the Tower -

Reading: "The Murder of the Princes", Source: Collis, Louise, Seven in the Tower, pp. 30-46.

Précis of Reading: This article retells the traditional account of the events immediately following Edward IV's death. Drawing heavily upon Thomas More's testimony, Miss Collis argues that although Richard may have been loyal to Edward IV and popular with the people as Duke of Gloucester, he was driven by cruel ambition to murder his newphews and unlawfully ascend the throne in 1483.

Suggested Questions on "The Murder of the Princes":

1) What evidence does the author cite to prove that the two sons of Edward IV were murdered in the Tower of London?

2) Who does she claim is responsible for the murder?

3) a. Cite three specific pieces of evidence that the author uses to support her claim.
   b. Do you accept each of these pieces of evidence as being reliable? Give reasons for your answer.

c) Position Two: Doubts concerning Richard III's Responsibility for the Murder of the Princes in the Tower -

Reading: "A Policeman Looks at the Murder of the Princes",

Source: Tey, Josephine (pseud.), The Daughter of Time, pp. 99-114.

Précis of Reading: This article is excerpted from a novel which revolves around a re-examination of the case against Richard III by a bedridden modern-day policeman. In the chapter selected for this reading the policeman, Inspector Grant, is going over the credibility of Thomas More's evidence which has been alleged to prove the case against Richard III. Suspecting the validity of this evidence, they proceed to hypothesize who has the better motive for the murder, Henry VII or Richard III.

Suggested Questions on "A Policeman Looks at the Murder of the Princes":

1) What reasons do Inspector Grant and his researcher give for doubting the evidence of Sir Thomas More?

2) Whom do they suspect had a better motive for murdering the princes, Richard III or Henry VII? Justify your answer.

3) Are Inspector Grant's and his researcher's reasons for doubting the evidence against Richard good reasons? Justify your answer.

LESSON V

Topic: Bibliography Assignment

Objectives: 1) To ascertain the extent of the local library resources on Richard III and the murder of the princes in the Tower before proceeding with further research.

2) To introduce the students to certain specific library research skills required for further exploration of the topics including:
   a. Using the library card catalogue
   b. Using the preface and table of contents to predict what information might be contained in a particular book.
   c. Using the index of a book to locate a specific piece of information.
   d. Using a footnote to locate further information on a topic and to cross check an author's reference.

Procedures: Students will be asked by the teacher to select a particular work of non-fiction from the student bibliography which is provided with the instructional plan. An effort will be made to ensure that a variety of books are selected by the class. Each student will then look up the book he selected in the card catalogue of the school or public library, noting the call number of the book and whatever other information is contained on the card.

Once the student has exhausted the information available on the card, he will proceed to locate the book in the stacks. His next task will be to examine the fly leaf, table of contents and preface to determine what information the book might contain. After examining these parts of the book the student will write a brief summary of the work stating his prediction of what the author will say about the murder of the princes in the Tower. Representative reports will be read to the class by students called upon to do so by the teacher.

Following these reports each student in the class will be asked to return to the book he selected in order to locate a particular piece of information from the index. The piece of information will be one which would be, as far as possible, common to each book. An example might be to find out the year that Sir Thomas More wrote The History of King Richard III.

The final assignment would involve the student tracing the source of a footnote. Each student will be asked to select a footnote from the book he has been using for the above assignment. The student will then check the library card catalogue to find out if that book is available. If the book is in the library, he will locate the passage which has been footnoted in order to ascertain whether or not it has been accurately cited in his original book.

If the book is not in the library, the student will then be assigned to check an encyclopedia or some other general reference book in order to determine whether of not it reports Richard III as the murderer of the two princes. They will then copy out the key sentence or paragraph on a piece of paper which contains that book's conclusion on Richard's part in the fate of the princes.

This quotation will then be appropriately footnoted as to its source for example, Encyclopedia Britannica, 1959, vol. 17, p. 346 and the piece of paper will be placed on a bulletin board. This exercise will not only have provides these students with further experience with a form of footnote citations, but the aggregate of these pieces of paper on the bulletin board will further reinforce the idea that there are conflicting interpretations on the matter of the death of the princes in the Tower.

LESSON VI

Topic: Constructing an Initial Hypothesis.

Objectives:

1) To have each student formulate an initial explanation for the deaths of the two princes in the Tower to guide further research.
2) To promote the understanding that a hypothesis is only a beginning explanation for an event which must be tested against further evidence.

Procedures: The teacher will ask the class to identify the hypotheses made by the detective during the beginning stages of his investigation in the mystery story of Lesson II. Once the hypotheses have been identified, the teacher will next ask the class to recall how these hypotheses were tested and developed by the detective until he came to a conclusion as to who committed the crime. The class will also be asked to take particular note of how the hypothesis not only could guide the detective's questioning, but could also be either refined or totally discarded as succeeding pieces of evidence tested its validity.

Following class discussion on the role and function of the hypothesis in the mystery story, each student will be asked to formulate his own hypothesis on the individual(s) and motivation(s) responsible for the deaths of the princes in the Tower. He will be required to support this initial hypothesis by drawing upon the information provided in Lesson III and Lesson IV. Each student will hand in a copy of his initial hypothesis to the teacher. This will enable the teacher to determine not only whether or not the student has adequately grasped the notion of hypothesis, but it will provide a useful future point of comparison with the refined hypothesis.

LESSON VII

Topic: The Princes In the Tower: Criticizing the Evidence.

Objectives: 1) To explicate some principles of historical criticism in terms of the case of the princes.

2) To have the students apply these principles of criticism to the evidence presented in the murder of the princes in the Tower.

Procedures: Faced with the problem of recouncilling conflicting accounts, and possibly conflicting hypotheses, as to who actually murdered the princes in the Tower, the students will move to examining evidence. In order to create the conditions for this the class will enter into a discussion, growing out of Lesson VI, concerning who might be responsible for murdering the princes and what his motives might be. These will be written on the board as hypotheses.

At this point the teacher will ask the students to consider the kinds of questions that might be asked to prove one hypothesis or another. These questions will be written under the various hypotheses. From time to time, this list will be supplemented by additional questions from the teacher in order to generate and direct further student questions. Examples of such questions might be as follows:

1) Did Sir James Tyrrel ride to London sometime in late July with orders from Richard III to murder the young princes in the Tower?

2) Did the constable of the Tower know that Richard III planned to murder the two boys on the night he turned the keys of the Tower over to Tyrrel?

3) When did Richard III make up his mind that he would become king?

4) Were the two young princes prisoners in the Tower of London?

5) Exactly when and where did the alleged murder of the princes take place?

6) Who finally confessed to the murder of the princes in the Tower? Under what circumstances was the confession made?

7) Did the Duke of Buckingham raise a revolt in October, 1483 to rescue the princes from the Tower?

8) Did Richard III "lose the hearts of the people" when rumours that he murdered the princes became known?

9) Was Thomas Morton "Richard's bitterest enemy"? Did he really write the History of King Richard III which has been attributed to Sir Thomas More?

10) Were the princes in the Tower illegitimate sons of Edward IV?

11) Was King Edward IV Richard III's legitimate brother or his illegitimate half-brother?

12) By what right did Henry VII depose Richard III and become king himself?

13) Did Richard III drown his brother, the Duke of Clarence, in a butt (keg) of Malmsey wine?

14) Did Richard III accuse Lord Hastings of treason and sorcery and then have him immediately executed on a handy log in the courtyard of the Tower?

Suggested Student Assignment: Each student will select one research question for individual study and prepare a one or two page written report on his findings for future class discussion. The student report should be made according to the following guidelines:

1) State how the research question you have chosen relates to your hypothesis about who murdered the princes in the Tower.

2) Prepare an answer to the research question citing the sources you have drawn upon for evidence.

3) In your opinion, is the evidence you found to support your answer good evidence? Explain.

Class Presentation of Answers to Research Questions:

Prior to class presentation of the research question by the students, the teacher will familiarize himself with the eight selected principles of historical criticism outlined in the unit objectives (p.). In order to expedite this presentation of reports on the individual research question the class will be divided into smaller groups of eight to ten students each. Each student, in turn, will present a summary or his findings on the research question to his group, indicating how he feels the evidence supports his conclusion. In order to allow the other students to prepare their reactions to the evidence, he will pass out a duplicated summary of his report to all of the members of his group on the day preceding his report.

Group discussion as to strengths and weaknesses of the evidence presented by the student will take place following each report. During this discussion the teacher will ask the students to begin recording reasons why they consider a particular type of evidence to be strong or weak. A classification system for rating evidence might be suggested at this time. For example; evidence may be rated as being either fact, probability, possibility or a doubtful occurrence depending upon its source. The students will be encouraged to make generalizations about the kinds of evidence which may be accepted while they discuss the relative strengths and weaknesses of the evidence provided in the reports. The procedure described above may be illustrated through the following example:

(i) Student Research Question - Did Sir James Tyrrel ride to London sometime in late July 1483 with orders from Richard III to murder the young princes in the Tower?

(ii) Possible Student Response - The student might state that he has chosen this research question, because an affirmative answer will support his hypothesis that Richard III was guilty of murdering the princes in the Tower. In researching the problem, he finds that both Sir Thomas More and Polydore Vergil are cited by many secondary sources as authorities for this evidence. Referring directly to the relevant passages of More's The History of King Richard III and Polydore's English History, he finds that they have both been quoted accurately. He finds, in fact, that Sir Thomas More traces the events of the fatal night in elaborate detail. The student might then argue that he accepts this evidence as reliable, because two independent sources agree. He might further defend his conviction with the discovery that Thomas More was highly regarded by many of his contemporaries.

At this point the teacher might ask the students to consider whether or not two independent sources giving the same testimony might make that testimony undisputable fact. A similar question might be asked regarding the competence of an observer. If these points are agreed upon, then they might be recorded at this time as tentative generalizations to be used as guidelines for historical criticism.

Since Sir Thomas More's and Polydore Vergil's testimonies are central to the historic case indicting Richard III of the crime, it is likely that other students will have uncovered criticisms of these sources in their research. If not they will have at least been introduced to the conflicting viewpoints regarding this testimony in a comparison of the Collis and Tey articles (see Lesson IV). As a result, some students may point out that there is evidence to suggest that Thomas Morton is the true author of the More article. To support this evidence they may point out that More must have obtained it from someone else because he was only five years of age at the time of the alleged murder. Additional evidence would show that More had been a page in the household of Thomas Morton.

At this point the teacher or a student would ask the group if they would suggest that the origin of a document presented as evidence might be a general principle of criticism to keep in mind. Again this would be recorded, if agreed upon by the group, as a tentative generalization.

Since Thomas Morton also plays a major role in the question of Richard III's responsibility in the alleged murder of the princes, a further question might be raised regarding possible reasons for this accusation. Some students might point out that Morton had taken part in Buckingham's rebellion against Richard III and was imprisoned by him for this action. Escaping custody, Morton had fled to France and joined Henry Tudor, becoming Henry's Archbishop of Canterbury following the Battle of Bosworth in 1485. Students, noticing this close connection between Morton and Henry VII, might deduce that he had good reason to produce an account of Richard's having murdered his two nephews as it would help justify Tudor claims to the throne. Inquiring into Polydore Vergil's background a similar criticism may be made regarding his evidence. Polydore had come to England in 1501 from Italy and had subsequently been appointed official historian to Henry VII. Further student inquiry into the role of an official historian in the fifteenth century would reinforce doubts concerning his impartiality.

Again attention might be drawn to these two new points of criticism. It might be pointed out that the reasons behind the production of a document or other forms of evidence should be considered in judging the veracity of that evidence. Attention might also be drawn to the prevailing ideas of the times, in this case the fifteenth century idea of a historian, when examining evidence. Using the same procedure suggested above, these two points would be recorded as tentative generalizations of guidelines for historical criticism after some discussion.

This research question also offers scope for tentatively establishing the other selected principles of historical criticism to be taught in this unit. For example, More's and Polydore's accounts may be checked against the few contemporary chronicles for verification. This would provide an opportunity to demonstrate the principle of using contemporary testimony to verify recollected testimony. Examining More's and Polydore's accounts for such external consistency as well as for internal consistency might help to establish a tentative conclusion about the reason for any inconsistencies.

The students may want to suggest other principles of historical criticism arising from their research questions. These will also be recorded as tentative generalizations whose validity as guidelines for criticism will be checked as evidence for other research questions is examined.

LESSON VIII

Topic: Refining the Hypothesis.

Objective: To have each student refine his original hypothesis in the light of validated evidence.

Procedure: The teacher will instruct each student to write a report identifying who he believes to be responsible for the murder of the princes in the Tower. He will support this accusation by stating what that individual's motives might be, and by citing new evidence gathered through an examination of the research question. In his report, the student will also specify why he has accepted or rejected pieces of evidence by making reference to the guidelines of historical criticism developed in the previous lesson. This written report will be evaluated by the teacher against the student's initial hypothesis to determine the extent to which it represents a refined hypothesis.

LESSON IX

Topic: Is There Enough Evidence to Convict Richard of the Crime?

Objectives:
1) To reinforce the criteria previously selected as guidelines for judging evidence.
2) To synthesize the evidence gathered by the various members of the class concerning Richard's responsibility for the murder of the princes in the Tower.

Procedures: A trial scenario will be used to bring together the array of evidence gathered by the class for and against Richard. Rather than actually bringing him to trial the students will simulate a hearing to determine whether there is enough evidence to indict Richard for the murder of the princes. In order to conduct the hearing the class will divide itself into three groups. One group will consist of those students who hold that there is sufficient evidence to bring Richard III to trial. A second group will consist of those students who are convinced by the evidence that Richard is not responsible for the disappearance of the princes; while the third group will be made up of the remainder who are unable to decide. Each of these groups will take different roles in the simulated hearing. The first group will become the committee for the prosecution, the second group will be the committee for the defence, while the third will become the judge and jury.

It will be the function of the committee for the prosecution to prepare the case against Richard III. To do so they will marshall the evidence to this effect and prepare to rebutt possible objections from the defence. It will likewise be the responsibility of the committee for the defence to prepare the case which defends Richard.

The arguments both for the defence and the prosecution might be best stated if each committee designated some of their number as witnesses. For example, the prosecution could choose to bring Thomas Morton or Dominic Mancini to the stand, while the defence could bring Robert Lovell or Bishop Stillington to the stand. These "witnesses" could be coached by their respective committees and could, on taking the stand, be cross examined by the opposite side.

After the presentations by prosecution and defence witnesses each of these two groups will be responsible for summarizing their arguments in the form of a two or three page brief to be presented to the third group. This third group will not only be responsible for making the decision to bring Richard III to trial, but would also oversee the general meaning of the hearing. They would, for example, determine whether or not certain testimony was admissible or inadmissible as evidence based upon the criteria for judging evidence that were developed in Lesson VII.

CHAPTER V

FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN

I. INTRODUCTION

A group of ten specialy selected secondary social studies teachers and the seven social studies graduate students in the Department of Secondary Education at the University of Alberta were asked to evaluate the instructional plan. In evaluating the plan, the respondents were required to make judgments concerning the congruency between the objectives and the instructional strategies of the plan, as well as making an evaluation of its teachability.

The judgmental instrument itself was divided into two parts; one part was devoted to statements concerning congruency, and the second part contained statements on the teachability of the plan. The respondent was asked to rate each statement by designating the point along a 1-5 continuum which best represented his estimation of the plan's performance on that item. On the 1-5 scale, the lowest number was to indicate that the plan performed poorly in relation to that item, the highest number was to indicate that the plan performed well. In addition to choosing a numerical rating each respondent was provided with the opportunity to write additional general or specific comments concerning the congruency and the teachability of the instructional plan.

Analysis of Responses on Judgmental Instrument

Two factors were considered in translating the responses of the teachers and graduate students into an overall indication of their judgments regarding the congruency and the teachability of the instructional plan. The first factor of the mean rating of the seventeen respondents was considered on each item, as well as a grand mean being computed on the responses to all the questions in each of the two categories; congruency and teachability. Clearly any number chosen as a critical figure in determining acceptance or rejection of the plan as to these qualities would be purely arbitrary. Nevertheless, it is clear that a mean rating of 4 or better on an individual statement would constitute significant judgmental agreement on any particular aspect of congruency or teachability. This figure is on the positive end of the continuum and is far enough removed from the mid-point of the scale to control for the tendency of the mean of such Likert-type scales to regress towards the median point.

The second factor considered in translating these responses was the written comments and remarks of the teachers and graduate students. These are reported with the respondent ratings of the individual statements. The researcher felt that these comments would provide him with insights into some of the judges' rationales for assigning a particular rating to a statement. In addition it would partially obviate the problem of interpreting numerical ratings caused by the tendency of individuals to use differential ratings to express the same opinion.

II. CONGRUENCY OF THE PLANNED STRATEGIES WITH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE UNIT

In this, the first section of the judgmental instrument, five statements were listed as indicators of the congruency or the internal consistency between the proposed strategies and the objectives of the instructional plan. The results of the judges' ratings of the congruency of the instructional plan are indicated in Table I. The following is a discussion of the reaction of the individual respondents to each of the statements.

General Judgmental Reaction to Congruency. The grand mean of the judges' overall rating would seem to suggest that the proposed strategies of the instructional plan are congruent with its stated objectives in the opinion of the judges. Ratings on the individual statements indicate that the materials selected for the plan were suited to the skills and concepts to be taught, that the proposed learning activities were consistent with the stated purposes of the unit, and that the skills and concepts to be taught in the proposed plan were congruent with the stated elements of the historical method. On the other hand, the same ratings indicate that the major purposes of the unit were not clearly enough stated in terms of pupil behaviour, and that the student evaluation procedures did not necessarily establish the extent to which the major objectives of the plan had been achieved.

TABLE VII

JUDGES' RATINGS REGARDING THE CONGRUENCY OF INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS PROPOSED STRATEGIES WITH OBJECTIVES

		PERCENTAGE OF JUDGES CHOOSING EACH RATING				
STATEMENT NUMBER		1	2	3	4	5
VERY WELL	5	18%	47%	60%	12%	41%
RATING	4	41%	35%	26%	58%	41%
	3	12%	18%	14%	18%	12%
	2	29%	0%	0%	12%	6%
POORLY	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
N =		17	17	15	17	17
$\bar{X}$ =		3.5	4.1	4.5	3.6	4.2

General comments regarding the congruency between the proposed strategies and the objectives of the instructional plan provide further clarification of these ratings. Five respondents remarked that some of the objectives of the plan were stated in terms of teacher behaviour and that they therefore found it difficult to react to all the statements assessing congruency. Apart from this criticism the judges were generally positive towards the "goodness of fit" between the proposed strategies and the objectives of the instructional plan.

Judgmental Reactions to Individual Statements on Congruency

In order to further explicate the reactions of the judges to specific aspects of congruency between the proposed strategies and the stated objectives of the instructional plan, let us now consider the responses to the five individual statements which deal with congruency.

1) Are the major purposes of the unit clearly stated in terms of pupil behaviour?

The mean judgmental rating of 3.5 given for this statement would appear to indicate that the teachers and graduate students were in some doubt as to the clarity with which the major purposes of the unit were stated. Five of the seventeen respondents rated the statement rather low on the scale, while only three respondents indicated that the purposes of the plan were very well stated in terms of pupil behaviour.

One major source of criticism indicated by the written comments, was the fact that while some of the purposes were stated in terms of pupil behaviour, others were stated in terms of teacher behaviour. Four graduate students and one social studies teacher pointed this out as being a weakness of the instructional plan. Lesson objectives singled out by these respondents for criticism included; objective 3 in Lesson I, objective 1 in Lesson III, objectives 1, 2 and 3 in Lesson IV and objective 2 in Lesson V. Strictly speaking, the objectives are not stated in terms of student behaviour as suggested by Krathwohl and Bloom (1964). Nevertheless, the objectives criticized by the respondents clearly imply specific student behaviour. For example objective (3), Lesson I reads; "[t]o sensitize the students to some of the possibilities for error in writing about the past". The implication is obvious; the student should begin to become sensitized to the possibility that because historians deal with fallible data, they are likely to make errors in interpreting what actually happened in the past. At this point, however, sensitization cannot be measured, it is merely the beginning stage of establishing an attitude, a disposition to act in a certain manner. Objective (1) in Lesson III and objectives (1), (2) and (3) in Lesson IV contain clear implications of expected student cognitive outcomes. Similarily, objective (2) in Lesson V implies specific bibliographic skills which should be acquired by the student.

A second specific criticism regarding the major purposes of the unit was expressed by two social studies graduate students. They observed that many of the purposes of the instructional unit were stated in terms of products, while the overall goal of the unit was to teach the historian's process. One argued that this inconsistency could be rectified by restating some of the objectives in terms of observable daily learner processes rather than in terms of products, such as the production of a hypothesis or an answer to a research question.

Certainly many of the outcomes which the students are being evaluated on in this unit appear in the form of products rather than being processes. For example, in Lessons III and IV the students are asked to produce answers based on assigned readings and visual materials, Lessons II, VI and VIII they are required to produce written hypotheses and in Lesson VII they are required to present an oral report. In themselves these outcomes are products, but viewed as component parts of a historian's inquiry procedure, they are representative of a process. Bruner (1961) argued that process-oriented education should "have the objective of leading the child to discover for himself (p. 77)". The overall objective of this unit is to have the student discover the historian's method by employing some of the procedures the historian uses to solve a historical problem. The products expected from each lesson; familiarization with the background of the historical problem, formulation of a hypothesis and a critical evaluation of evidence are products of the historian as he employs his method.

2) Are the materials selected for the unit suited to the skills and concepts that are being taught? In other words, do the readings and other visual materials allow the student to examine and criticize various interpretations of a historical event and to arrive at his own interpretations using the historical method?

A mean judgmental rating of 4.1 would appear to suggest that the printed and other visual materials are congruent with the stated learning objectives of the instructional plan. Eight of the seventeen respondents rated these materials as being very well suited to the skills and concepts being taught, while only three of the respondents placed their ratings as low as the mid-point of the scale.

One teacher and two graduate students expressed some reservations concerning what they felt to be the rather advanced reading levels of two of the three readings from Lesson IV and of some of the books on the annotated bibliography of source materials. While no specific items on the bibliography were identified, the articles "England During the Wars of the Roses" and "A Policeman Looks at the Murder of the Princes" were singled out by certain respondents as, perhaps, being of too advanced reading level. The results of subsequent reading difficulty tests on these two articles are contained in Appendix D and further reference is made to these articles in discussing readability later in this chapter.

3) Do the learning activities maintain consistency with the stated purposes of this unit?

The central question of congruency was broached directly in this statement. The mean judgmental rating of 4.5 for this statement would, therefore, not only appear to be indicative of a general feeling among the graduate students and the social studies teachers that the perscribed learning activities maintained a high degree of consistency with the stated purposes of the unit, but would also seem to be a significant indicator of their acceptance of the overall congruency of the plan. Nine of fifteen respondents conferred the highest rating on this statment, while only two judges rated the consistency of learning activities with the purposes of the unit as low as the mid-point on the continuum.

One graduate student both clarified and amplified his rationale for highly rating the internal consistency of the instructional plan. He noted that the strategies presented in the plan were "very congruent" with the plan's intended outcomes and that the practice of building each lesson on the previous one, while extending into a new dimension of the historical method, created a "strong goodness of fit" within the plan.

There were only fifteen respondents to this third statement, because two graduate students felt themselves unable to suggest a rating. They each asserted that this was so because they could not ascertain the degree of consistency between the learning activities of the unit and its stated purposes, unless the learning objectives were stated in terms of observable learner behaviour.

4) Do the student evaluation procedures, ie. the submission of brief written assignments, a library assignment and a brief oral report; establish with some degree of confidence the extent to which the major objectives of this unit have been achieved.

A mean rating of 3.6 on this statement would seem to suggest that the judges had reservations concerning the plan *vis à vis* this criterion of congruency. Only two respondents indicated that the student evaluation procedures established very well that the major objectives of the unit had been achieved, while five judges rated the plan's performance at 3 or less on this point. Nevertheless, the majority (58%) of the respondents gave the plan a moderately high 4 rating on the validity of its evaluation procedures.

Only one respondent, a graduate student, provided any written elaboration of his rationale for not being completely satisfied with the validity of the evaluation procedures. Referring to his criticism of the stated objectives of the plan, he noted that both the objectives and the evaluation procedures tended to emphasize products rather than processes of historical inquiry. While the evaluation procedures might establish with some degree of confidence the extent to which the "stated" major objectives have been achieved, they do not adequately measure the overall objective of learning the process of the historian's inquiry.

Although this respondent was alone in explicating his reasons for being uncomfortable with the internal consistency of the evaluation procedures, his comments might allow one to infer that other respondents may have indicated similarly low ratings for the same reasons. Alternatively, with reference to criticisms expressed by some of the respondents to the first statement, the fact that the major objectives were not clearly stated in terms of pupil behaviour might also be suggestive of reasons for a low mean rating for this item.

5) Do the skills and concepts taught in this unit meet with the elements of historical method?

A mean rating of 4.2 would seem to suggest that the skills and concepts taught in this unit are congruent with the elements of historical method, which had been previously validated by a panel of historians and teachers and used to construct the instructional plan. Fourteen of the seventeen respondents rated this aspect of the plan at 4 or 5 on the 1-5 continuum which had been provided as the judgmental scale.

One respondent, a graduate student, had reservations about the "mechanical" nature of the historian's process as expressed in this instructional plan. While he agreed that the skills and concepts that were taught in the unit were congruent with the elements of historical method, he noted that this outline of the historical method underplayed the role of intuition and creative insight in the process. No other respondent commented thusly, however, this point was specifically noted by one of the historians when validating elements of historical method. He suggested that by articulating and generalizing certain elements of the historian's method the process was made to appear rather more mechanical than it actually was to many historians.

As has been noted in Chapter III, this is an unavoidable occurrence when abstracting and generalizing an inquiry process. Nevertheless, the point is well taken. Although the instructional plan has allowed for some play of imagination and intuition in the area of historical criticism, the teacher should be generally aware when teaching this unit that historical inquiry does not consist of a rigidly perscribed set of procedures.

Conclusions Regarding Judgmental Reaction to Congruency

It would seem from the above analysis of both the judges' numerical ratings and their comments on the individual statements concerning congruency, that generally the proposed strategies were internally consistent with the objectives of the instructional plan. However, it would also appear that failure to consistently state objectives in terms of pupil behaviour made it difficult for the respondents to accurately assess congruency.

III. ASSESSMENT OF THE TEACHABILITY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN

In the second section of the judgmental instrument, six statements were listed as being indicators of the teachability of the instructional plan. The results of the judges' impressionistic ratings of the teachability of the plan are indicated below in Table II. A discussion of the responses to the individual statements concerning teachability will follow a general discussion of the table.

TABLE VIII

JUDGES' IMPRESSIONISTIC RATINGS OF THE TEACHABILITY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN

		PERCENTAGE OF JUDGES CHOOSING EACH RATING					
STATEMENT NUMBER		1	2	3	4	5	6
VERY WELL	5	18%	47%	6%	53%	19%	35%
	4	47%	35%	24%	29%	31%	29%
	3	12%	12%	41%	12%	25%	18%
	2	12%	6%	12%	0%	19%	18%
POORLY	1	12%	0%	18%	6%	6%	0%
N =		17	17	17	17	16	17
$\bar{X}$ =		3.5	4.2	2.8	4.2	3.4	4.1

General Judgmental Reaction to Teachability

A grand mean rating of 3.6 on statements concerning this aspect of the instructional plan seems to indicate that the judges had some reservations as to its teachability. More specifically, these respondents, as a group, appeared to question the psychological soundness of the plan, its lack of provision of materials for students of varying reading interests and abilities, the clarity with which the goals of the individual lessons and the entire unit are displayed to the students and its sufficiency of appropriate instructional resources. Among these, the alleged lack of provision for individual differences was particularly noted as a weakness in the plan.

Alternatively, the plan seemed to find overall approval from the judges for its sequential and systematic development of the concepts and skills of the historical method and for the fact that, in the opinion of most of the individual respondents, it appeared to be generally teachable. Of particular interest in relation to this last point is the fact that even though the respondents as a group rated the teachability of the plan below the arbitrarily fixed mean score of 4.0, a majority of them indicated that they would be very well able to teach the unit as outlined in the instructional plan.

This seeming contradiction suggests one further danger of assigning such an arbitrary "critical" figure as a determinant of overall judgmental acceptance or rejection of the instructional plan. It is important to note, therefore, that the 4.0 mean, as a level of determining acceptance or rejection of the teachability of the instructional plan, although one indicator of judgmental opinion, remains an arbitrary figure. A mean score of 4.2 representing the judges' opinion of their ability to actually teach the unit as outlined, may, therefore, be interpreted as these respondents evaluating the plan as being generally teachable, but having certain specific weaknesses. Moreover, one might also infer that these particular respondents feel that while they can overcome these specific weaknesses to teach the unit well, where perhaps other teachers could not.

A second general observation which may be made at this point concerns a contrast between the responses of the teachers and those of the graduate students as to both the teachability and the internal congruency of the instructional plan. It may be seen from Tables III and IV that generally the graduate students assigned higher ratings to the instructional plan in both areas of evaluation, and that the variation between teacher/graduate student ratings was greater with regard to teachability than in respect to internal congruency.

TABLE IX

MEAN IMPRESSIONISTIC RATINGS OF GRADUATE STUDENTS TO STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE INTERNAL CONGRUENCY AND THE TEACHABILITY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN

Respondent	Mean Rating for Statements on Congruency	Mean Rating for Statements on Teachability
1	4.2	2.5
2	4.6	4.8
3	4.2	3.7
4	4.4	4.3
5	3.2	3.7
6	4.0	4.0
7	4.8	5.0
$\bar{X}$ Group	4.20	4.00

Any reasons suggested for this variance between the two groups of respondents will, in this study, be of a purely speculative nature. Nevertheless, it might be supposed that the graduate students would confer higher ratings on a new instructional plan, because they are more actively involved in research themselves and, therefore, more positively disposed towards novel approaches to instruction. A supposed dichotomy between theory and practise might also be suggested as a reason for the different responses from the two groups. Graduate students, by the nature of their work, may be more favourably disposed towards an instructional unit presented to them as a theoretical plan than are teachers who might perceive more immediate practical difficulties of implementation. Finally, it could be speculated that because the developer of the instructional plan was a colleague, empathy may have influenced the graduate students' favourable overall response to the plan.

TABLE X

MEAN IMPRESSIONISTIC RATINGS OF TEACHERS TO STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE INTERNAL CONGRUENCY AND THE TEACHABILITY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN

Respondent	Mean Rating for Statements on Congruency	Mean Rating for Statements on Teachability
1	4.8	4.5
2	4.2	3.8
3	3.8	4.0
4	2.8	1.5
5	3.8	3.6
6	4.2	3.2
7	3.8	3.7
8	4.4	3.8
9	4.6	4.5
10	2.2	2.0
$\bar{X}$ Group	3.86	3.46

Analysis of Judges' Responses to Individual Statements Concerning Teachability of the Instructional Plan

1) Is the unit psychologically sound - are the skills and concepts comprehensible to grade 10 level students?

Although a plurality of respondents assigned an impressionistic rating of 4 to this statement, a significant number of them opined that the plan demanded skill and concept comprehension beyond the capabilities of "academically poorer" grade X students. One graduate student and two teachers, who assigned ratings of 1 or 2 to this item, specified this as a point of weakness in the teachability of the plan.

There was a considerable variance of opinion between graduate students and teachers on this particular item. While the graduate students assigned this statement an average rating of 4.1, the teachers gave it a rating of 3.0. With the exception of one respondent, all graduate students chose a 4 or 5 rating to this statement, while five teachers assigned it a rating of 3 or less.

With reference to the aforementioned speculations regarding the differences between the graduate students' and the teachers' assessments of the instructional plan, it might be supposed that the teachers are more immediately conscious of the practical difficulties of the implementation of an instructional plan. It might be further speculated that many teachers have a tendency to cast the abilities of students in a negative light, by generalizing from the weaknesses of a few. Such an attitude might lead to an unfortunate self-fulfilling prophesy.

2) Does the unit provide for sequential and systematic development of the concepts and skills of the historical method?

An overall mean rating of 4.2 assigned to this item by the judges would seem to indicate that the plan provides well for the sequential and systematic development of the concepts and skills of the historical method. Although two teachers and one graduate student assigned ratings of 2 or 3 to this statement, no specific comments were made as to the reasons for this perceived weakness.

Three respondents, who rated the instructional plan as providing very well for the sequential and systematic development of concepts and skills needed in historial inquiry, amplified these opinions by adding written comments to the judgmental instrument. One graduate student singled out this sequential development as being the strongest point of the plan, another favourably noted the logically sound arrangement of the individual lessons in the plan, while a teacher indicated that the sequential arrangement made good use of inquiry techniques.

3) Does the unit provide for individual differences in reading abilities and interests that might be found in an average grade 10 history class?

This was clearly the weakest aspect of the instructional plan in the opinion of the respondents, with a mean judgmental rating of 2.8. It was also the individual statement which elicited the greatest number of responses from the judges. In addition, a number of the general criticisms of the plan centred around the fact that many of the respondents perceived the unit to be rather academic in approach and not suited for students of non-academic interests and poor reading abilities.

Some specific comments from the respondents regarding this aspect of the instructional plan included concern that the general level of reading required from the learner was too high for many grade 10 students. In this respect a graduate student pointed out that only one book had been provided in the unit's bibliography for students of below average reading level. A teacher indicated that it had been his experience that most grade 10 students suffered from reading problems and would, therefore, have difficulty in coping with the requirements of the unit.

The issue of reading difficulty must, of course, be raised and dealt with when presenting an instructional plan which leans heavily upon printed materials. As previously mentioned, two particular articles assigned as required reading in Lesson IV, "England During the Wars of the Roses" and "A Policeman Looks at the Murder of the Princes", were cited by several respondents as being difficult for many grade 10 level students. A Flesch readability formula was applied to these two articles as a check on the reading level. These results are discussed thoroughly in Appendix D.

The Flesch readability formula has at least two attributes which recommend its use in analyzing the reading ease of the printed materials for this plan. Firstly, Flesch is a recognized authority on the marks of readable style for senior student and adult literature, therefore, his formula is applicable to the printed materials in the instructional plan. Secondly, unlike some other readability tests, the Flesch formula counts proper nouns as well as other words in determining readable style. Since the articles in question contain a number of proper nouns, this formula is preferable to the others.

The Flesch readability formula did tend to somewhat allay the doubts of the reading ease of the two articles, in the opinion of the researcher. In applying this formula to the first article, "England During the Wars of the Roses", the reading grade placement was 7.8. Allowing for the common assumption that reading abilities vary either three grades below or three grades above the average in a given grade, the readability of this article is appropriate for the majority of grade 10 students. The teacher should, however, be aware that this reading might present comprehension difficulties for some students.

It would appear that the lack of frequent paragraphing and the generally long sentences contained in this passage "increase its reading difficulty, but these are somewhat mitigated by its overall brevity (Flesch, 1943,

p. 38). Another mitigating factor is the fact that the material dealt with in the article is concrete, albeit rather concise. Flesch (1943) remarks that concrete subject matter is more easily read than abstract material, although "density of language - the crowding of many concepts into a few words (p. 39)" decreases readability. It should be noted, however, that there are visual materials (slides and a geneological table) which will illustrate "this article when employing the instructional plan" in a classroom.

The second article, "A Policeman Looks at the Number of the Princes", clearly contains many of the attributes of a readable piece of literature as enunciated by Flesch. Firstly, it is in dialogue form, which tends to enhance reading ease (Flesch, 1943, p. 38). Secondly, the sentences are short, yet not overly concise and packed with meaning. Thirdly, the material dealt with in the article is of a concrete nature, and lastly, the words it contains have few affixed morphemes (Flesch, p. 38). The article is not, however, self-contained, but is a chapter taken from a novel. It would behoove the teacher, then, to briefly outline the larger work, The Daughter of Time, in order to place "A Policeman Looks at the Murder of the Princes" in its proper context.

The final criticism, suggested with regard to the reading requirements of the unit, concerned the lack of books for below-average readers on the bibliography. A readability test on these books would reveal little about the general teachability of the unit, because the student's selection of reading would be dictated by the research question he formulated, however, that geniune interest will enable the reader to "possibly overcome all stylistical hurdles (p. 38)". The assumption, may be proposed here that because the student poses his own question that he wants to answer from the literature, then he will have a genuine interest in discovering the answer to that question.

The fact that the statement really contained two distinct aspects of the plan for the respondents to react to generated some comment. A graduate student and a teacher each indicated that they believed that unit provided well for differences in interests amongst grade 10 students, without adequately attending to individual differences in reading abilities. This, perhaps, points out a weakness of the judgmental instrument.

> 4) Would you, as an experienced social studies teacher, be able to teach this unit to a grade 10 history class given the enclosed instructions and suggested materials?

As suggested before, this statement may be assumed to represent the overall teachability of the unit in the opinion of the respondents. The fact that the judges assigned this item a mean rating of 4.2, is significant in inferring general acceptance of the feasibility of teaching historical method to grade 10 history students using the proposed instructional plan. Also of some significance, is the fact that the variance between the responses of the teachers and the responses of the graduate students, noted earlier, was smaller on this item than on the aggregate of statements concerning teachability. The mean graduate student rating for this item was 4.4, while the mean teacher rating was 4.1. On the six statements concerning teachability, the mean rating by graduate students was 4.0 and the mean rating by teachers was 3.46.

Several teachers and graduate students made written comments on this item. Three graduate students and one teacher specifically indicated, by way of written comments, that they would like to teach the unit. One graduate student qualified his statement to the effect that he would also require the pictorial materials planned in the unit as well as the written materials in order to teach the unit successfully. A teacher rationalized his 3 rating for the item by arguing that he could teach the historical method, using the materials in the instructional plan, to a "class of high academic standing". On the other hand, one of the graduate students suggested that success in achieving the overall purpose of the unit depends "entirely upon the teacher".

5) Will classroom instruction as outlined in the enclosed plan enable the students to see their goals clearly in each lesson and in the entire unit of study?

A mean rating of 3.4 by the judges on this aspect of the teachability of the instructional plan would seem to suggest that in the opinion of the respondents the students will have difficulty seeing their goals clearly in each lesson and in the entire unit of study. Such an inability to see these goals may lead to a failure to communicate the importance of learning the process of history in this unit.

Three respondents provided written comments in reaction to this statement. A graduate student noted that the goals of each individual lesson could be more clearly seen by the students than could the goals of the overall unit. This may, however, be a characteristic of inductive instructional strategies generally, rather than a weakness of this particular instructional plan. Another graduate student stated that he was unable to respond to this item as a general statement, because he felt the clarity of goals depended upon classroom presentation. A teacher pointed out that it had been his experience that students have difficulty in seeing their goals in a lesson or in a unit. He regarded this as being a problem of the students, rather than a weakness of this unit.

6) Does the unit have sufficient appropriate instructional resources?

It may be inferred that the teachers and graduate students representing the judgmental panel generally felt that the unit was deficient in appropriate instructional resources, because they assigned it a mean rating of 3.8. Nevertheless, this decision is far from clear. The obvious relationship between the substance of this statement and that of statement (3) would tend to reinforce this inference drawn from the numerical mean rating. On the other hand, written comments by several of the respondents would suggest that, apart from some minor deficiencies this plan generally provides enough appropriate instructional resources.

Three respondents, all graduate students, provided written elaboration on comments in relation to this item. Two expressed general satisfaction with the instructional materials provided for in the plan, while noting the importance of more visual content. The third graduate student referred to his rating on statement (3), indicating that insufficient appropriate instructional resources are provided in the plan for students of varying abilities.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

I. SUMMARY

Beginning with the problem presented by the decline of history instruction in secondary schools in North America, as perceived by such educators and historians as Sellers (1969) and Eisenberg (1971), this study has sought to examine some of the reasons for this decline and suggest one possible solution. Before carrying out this examination, however, a brief analysis was made of the rationale for including history in the secondary school curriculum, under the assumption that such concern for history's decline can only be supported if its value to the curriculum could be appropriately justified.

Statements as to the value of history also provided a useful standard for assessing the effectiveness of present classroom instruction. Research studies and impressionistic classroom analyses by Hodgetts (1968), Palmer (1967) and Fenton (1971) among others, have been critical of contemporary secondary school history instruction, because it fails to produce those qualities which have been claimed in justifying its inclusion in a curriculum. The critical commentary of these educators seemed to centre on the supposed process/content dichotomy of instruction. While much of the inherent, contributive and instrumental value claimed for history is realized through the process of historical inquiry, instruction in the secondary schools has tended, by and large, to teach the products of such inquiry. A discussion of process as opposed to content-oriented instruction revealed that assumptions as to their separateness within a discipline were unwarranted. It was concluded that content and process are, in fact, two components of the same entity and as such process should be viewed as an inseparable mechanism for ordering and integrating content (Parker and Rubin, 1966, pp. 42-49).

Having so established the need for the study and the theoretical justification for a particular learning philosophy, the major portion of this study was devoted to the development of an instructional plan for a unit designed to teach the structure of historical inquiry to a secondary school history class. The elements of historical method to be taught in this instructional plan were culled from literature on the historian's craft. These elements were then presented to a panel of six faculty members of the Department of History at the University of Alberta and twelve Edmonton secondary school teachers with majors in history for validation.

After submission to the above panel, the validated elements of the historical method became the central objectives of the unit to be developed. The instructional plan was designed in the form of a case study in order to allow the learner to focus his attention on a particular, representative historical problem amenable to the use of the historical method of inquiry. Following Parker and Rubin's (1966) precept that "learning objectives should entail direct struggle and that transfer is never assured (p. 13)" it was assumed that such an instructional procedure would inculcate a knowledge of historical method.

Since the purpose of this study was the development of an instructional plan, the unit was not field tested at this point. Rather it was submitted to a panel of experienced secondary social studies teachers, ten of whom were currently actively teaching in Edmonton and district secondary schools and seven of whom were presently graduate students in the Department of Secondary Education at the University of Alberta. These judges were asked to rate the proffered instruction plan on the basis of eleven suggested criteria taken as being representative of the internal consistency between objectives and strategies of the unit and the overall teachability of the unit to a grade 10 level history class.

The judgmental panel, in the opinion of the researcher, accepted the instructional plan as being internally congruent, with the reservation that the learning objectives were not clearly enough stated in terms of learner behavioral outcomes. The fact that the majority of the panel were in agreement that they, as experienced social studies teachers, could teach this unit as designed to a grade 10 history class led the researcher to conclude that the instructional plan had been accepted as being teachable. Nevertheless, some factors which might mitigate the effectiveness of the instructional plan were suggested by the panel. Central among these was the judgment that the recommended printed materials were inconsistent with the demonstrated abilities of students observed by some of the judges to have reading difficulties. Subsequent readability tests somewhat allayed these doubts by showing the readability of the articles in question to be within the reading competence of most grade 10 level students. The individual classroom teacher is advised, of course, to be cognizant of this consideration.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN

The formative evaluation of the instructional plan by a panel of graduate students and practising social studies teachers exposed the need for general recommendations in at least two areas to ease the task of implementing the plan. Firstly, the responses of these judges indicated a need to reiterate and clarify the overall objectives of the unit. Secondly, the questions they raised regarding the congruency of the reading abilities of the students and their actual reading competence suggested a need for some guidance in the use of the printed materials of the unit.

Teaching the Historian's Process

With respect to the first point, it is important that the teacher implement this unit in the classroom in the spirit of its overall purpose; that is in the spirit that this unit is intended to provide the student with a tool of inquiry, the tool commonly used by the historian. Clearly the student should also gain some insights into the circumstances surrounding the death of the princes in the Tower of London, but the content must be ordered and given meaning in the teacher-learner sense by this process of inquiry. The central assumption of this instructional plan is that it is only through directly employing this process that the student will learn the historian's method.

As an aid to achieving this overall purpose of the instructional plan, three recommendations are in order:

First, before implementing this instructional plan as a unit of study in the classroom, it is recommended that the teacher familiarize himself with the goal and the salient parts of historical inquiry. The goal of the historian is to try to arrive at a defensible interpretation of what, as nearly as possible, represents past actuality. To do so he employs a procedure which is commonly accepted by other historians. He begins with a problem or a question about some past event or series of events. From this he constructs a hypothesis which he tests by means of a rigorous internal and external criticism of existing evidence. The hypothesis is thus reformed or refined into a defensible interpretation of what actually happened in the past. He begins with a problem or a question about some past event or series of events. From this he constructs a hypothesis which he tests by means of a rigorous internal and external criticism of existing evidence. This hypothesis is gradually refined or reformed into a defensible synthesis which represents an interpretation of what actually happened in the past - his interpretation of historical truth.

A second recommendation concerns the way in which the historical method should be viewed by the teacher and students in the classroom. The instructional plan conceptualizes the historical method as having specific stages of inquiry. This is not to suggest, however, that the historical method is an inflexible mechanical process, devoid of human imagination and intuition. It should be viewed as a construct of a dynamic human inquiry process, which has been developed into a generally accepted methodology by its practioners. So conceived of it should be apparent that the process allows considerable flexibility for original approaches in its use.

It is recommended, therefore, that the teacher draw the student's attention to the reasons for the development of the aspects of the historical method which are suggested in the instructional plan, under the assumption that by understanding the reasons for these aspects of the historical method, the student will feel himself more able to adapt them for his particular purposes.

The teacher should recognize that, by doing so, the student will be more like the historian in his use of the historical method, because like the historian, he should recognize the strengths and limitations of the process and see that there is a role for personality, intuition and imagination in this form of inquiry. Furthermore, this should also enable the student to sharpen his critical faculties, because it will help him to establish just what it is that constitutes historical "proof" in the interpretation of past actuality.

To further reinforce this notion of flexibility of the historical method, the teacher should also encourage the students to move outside the specific recommendations contained in the insturctional plan. For example it is entirely possible in Lesson VI for a student to develop a hypothesis not suggested in the plan. Or the teacher could actively encourage students to pose other research questions for testing hypotheses which are not contained in Lesson VII. A third suggestion for reinforcing this notion of flexibility and creativity in the historian's method relates to the discovery of novel source materials. Jacques Barzun and Henry Graff (1957, p. 60) point out that very often the historian will imagine the kind of source which would answer his research question. By doing so, his imagination leads him into new ideas for resource materials as well as guiding him in his search.

The third recommendation intended to aid in implementing the instructional plan in the spirit of the historian's process, concerns the teacher adopting a particular attitude toward the relative importance of process and content. Clearly the producers of historical interpretations perceive the role of content differently from those who consume the information provided by those interpretations. The teacher will have been, as a former student in university-level history classes and as a reader of historical works, a consumer of historical interpretations. Very likely, if evidence by Hodgetts (1968) and others is any indication, the students will also have been cast in similar roles. Since the purpose of this instructional plan is to teach the historian's process, it is essential that both the teacher and the students adopt the stance of the producer of historical interpretations. That is, it is essential that the process of the historian is of primary importance in ordering and giving meaning to the content.

It is, therefore, recommended that the teacher view the learning of the process of the historian rather than the particular names and events which surround the murder of the princes in the Tower of London as the primary purpose of this unit. The teacher should realize that the only knowledge of content required by the students, is that which they feel they require in the process of attempting to solve this historical mystery. In other words, the teacher should recognize that he and the students are producing their own interpretations of past actuality, rather than consuming those produced by historians.

Obviating Possible Reading Problems

Formative evaluation of this unit by the teachers and the graduate students indicated that there was some question in the minds of these judges concerning the readability of some of the required reading selections. Although Flesch readability tests demonstrated that these selections in question were within the competence of most grade 10 level students, the fact remains that this unit is highly dependent upon the students' reading skills.

In order to obviate possible reading problems which may retard successful classroom implementation of this unit, three further recommendations are in order here.

First, it is recommended that before implementing this unit in the classroom, the teacher should first familiarize himself with the basic required readings within the instructional plan. In this way the teacher, having some knowledge of the reading competencies of the students in his class, will be able to anticipate possible areas of difficulty and be prepared to give these readings special attention.

Second, and extending from this first proposal, it is recommended that the teacher provide the necessary illustrative and contextual material for the classroom presentation of the readings. For example the two documents which provide the existing archeological and medical evidence regarding the murder of the princes should be presented simultaneously, because the first document provides photographic illustrations of the evidence. Or in Lesson IV is it recommended that the reading of "England During the Wars of the Roses" be done as a class, accompanied by a visual presentation of a geneological table of the related houses of Lancaster and York and pictures of the monarchs mentioned in the text. This should preclude any possible confusion which could develop from introducing the students to too many unfamiliar names in one reading. Also in the same lesson, the reading entitled "A Policeman Looks at the Murder of the Princes" should be prefaced by some contextual explanation from the teacher to the effect that this article is from a popular modern-day historical mystery novel The Daughter of Time. A brief explanation as to the identities of the "modern" characters in the reading should suffice.

Acceptance or rejection of the third recommendation regarding the reading required by this instructional plan is at the discretion of the teacher based upon his knowledge of the reading abilities of the students in his class. If, in the opinion of the teacher, students in a particular class might better apprehend the procedures of the detective through a dramatization of the short story suggested for reading in Lesson II, then he may choose to do so rather than having the class read the selection. Clearly a knowledge of the procedures of the detective will prepare the students for learning the historian's process.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Removal of the Process-Content Dichotomy

Theoretical literature and descriptive studies would seem to suggest that history instruction which views the student as a passive consumer of the historical interpretations of others, fails to achieve the outcomes presented as a rationale for such instruction. The findings by Palmer (1967) in the United States and Hodgetts (1968) in Canada, suggest that none of the three kinds of values which have been suggested for history in this study are, in fact, being successfully realized by content-centred instruction described in many history classrooms or implied by many textbooks. The inherent value claimed for history by Elton (1970) is probably not an outcome in history lessons that primarily communicate a "low-level knowledge" which is quickly forgotten (Hodgetts, pp. 70-72). The development and sharpening of "independent and critical thinking skills" claimed by Fenton and Good (1968, p. 9) as an instrumental value of history is an unlikely outcome of the "gray consensus version of the textbook, oblivious to the controversy, the viewpoints and the alternatives of all those in history who would have done things differently (Hodgetts, p. 24)". Furthermore the contributive value of history as "furnishing the cement to bind all other social science disciplines into a workable unity (Beard, 1932, p. 20) is doubtful when history is presented as a series of "textbook generalities and discrete, unpatterned facts [to be] learned by rote (Hodgetts, p. 70)".

If the above content-centred approaches to history instruction appear to be unsuccessful in realizing the intended outcomes of such instruction, the theoretical literature reviewed in this study seems to suggest that a methodology of instruction which treats the student as an active producer of knowledge will be more successful in achieving these ends. Parker and Rubin (1966), echoing John Dewey's admonition that what students do in the classroom is what they learn, have urged instructional planners to conceive of "process as the life-blood of content (p. 4)". Postman and Weingartner (1969) have stated that McLuhan's assertion that the medium is the message in relation to electronic communication has similar relevance for instructional planners.

> 'The medium is the message' implies that the invention of a dichotomy between content and method is both naïve and dangerous. It implies that the critical content of any learning experience is the method or process through which the learning occurs.
> (Postman and Weingartner, p. 19)

S. Samuel Shermis (1967, p. 9), speaking directly to the teaching of history suggests that history does not even exist as an entity outside of the procedures of the historian.

These writings, as outlined above, have led the researcher to conclude that an instructional plan which models the students' activities upon the procedures of inquiry commonly practiced by historians, offers a viable instructional methodology for grade 10 level students which will better realize the outcomes intended for the teaching of history. Thus far, however, such a conclusion still rests upon rational argument. Empirical verification necessarily must await experimental classroom implementation.

Implications for Transfer of the Historian's Method

Since the purpose of the instructional plan proposed in this study is primarily to provide students with an inquiry procedure commonly used by historians, mastery of this tool implies an ability to use it in dealing with other problems which are also amenable to that form of inquiry. Such problems would include questions of historical interest such as:

> Was the Serbian government responsible for the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo in 1914?
>
> Was there a French merchant class existing in Quebec before the English conquest of 1760?
>
> Was the "Donation of Constantine" a forgery?
>
> Did Franklin D. Roosevelt have advance warning Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor?

These problems have relevance to wider historical questions and by subjecting them to examination using the historical method, the student should also gain insights into the larger question.

Because the goal of the historian's method is to establish a defensible interpretation of what, as nearly as possible, approximates past actuality, it is possible that problems of immediate relevance to questions of the present may also be the focus of inquiry using the method. Examples of such questions might include:

> Did President Nixon have prior knowledge of the 'bugging' of the national headquarters of the Democratic Party in Washington?
>
> Was there a plot to assassinate John F. Kennedy in Dallas in 1963?

Questions of such contemporary relevance may be selected for inquiry by the historical method if they occurred in the past and if enough accessible data is available.

Teachers and Historians: Differing Orientations Toward History

The questionnaire that was submitted to six historians in the Department of History at the University of Alberta and twelve teachers with history majors, revealed some differences between teachers and historians in their respective orientations towards history. These differences were manifested both by the tendency for the two groups to focus on different elements of the historian's method and their differential tendencies to accept certain of these elements. For example, the historians tended to focus on the statements in the questionnaire which dealt with locating a historical problem, with formulating a hypothesis, and with the process of synthesizing historical data. The teachers on the other hand tended to focus greater attention on the elements of the questionnaire which dealt with the historian's procedures for gathering source materials and for criticizing evidence.

While both historians and teachers were fundamentally in agreement with the elements of the historical method, a minority of historians tended to disagree with some of the same elements that they focused their comments on while a minority of teachers had a tendency to disagree with some of the same statements that they focused on.

These differing orientations toward the historical method would appear to stem from the different perspectives that the teachers and historians respectively hold as consumers and producers of historical knowledge. The historian, as a producer of historical writings, seems to be more concerned with those aspects of the historical method which apply to the writing of history. Alternatively, the teacher, as a former student in university history classes and probably a continuing reader of historical literature, appears to be more interested in those aspects of the historical method which apply to the reading of history.

Clearly these conclusions are tentative because they are based on inferences drawn from the responses made by an extremely small sample population, but they still constitute an interesting hypothesis which is worthy of further direct investigation.

These different orientations of the historians as the producers of historical knowledge and the teachers as consumers of that knowledge have several implications for classroom instruction. One possible implication might be that teachers by viewing knowledge as a series of fixed conclusions, will see their own role as transmitters of "facts" and interpretations about the past to passive students. The corresponding implicit expectations of student behaviour stemming from this type of instruction are that they should passively accept these facts and interpretations. Although many of these teachers very explicitly request active questioning and discussion of these conclusions it is unlikely that the students will be prepared to do much more than repeat that which has been presented to them, in the manner it has been presented. To extend the implication further, the work of Edwin Fenton (1966) seems to be implicitly based on such a consumer orientation to historical knowledge, because the object of his instructional activities with students seems to be to communicate some of the elements of the historian's inquiry without allowing the students to use that process in a coherent set of procedures.

A static conception of historical knowledge is another possible implication of this consumer orientation. For example historical "facts" are likely to be viewed as empirical truths, rather than being generally accepted interpretations of phenomena reported by observers who have particular orientations toward that phenomena. E.H. Dance (1960, pp. 9-10) reports that even such a supposed fact as "[the] Battle of Hastings [took place in] A.D. 1066" contains at least two questionable statements of fact as well as an implicit religious preference. Furthermore, the distinction between generally accepted fact and a particular historian's interpretation of these facts becomes blurred when history is presented as a static array of conclusions to be learned.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Recommendations for Further Evaluation of the Instructional Plan

The instructional plan which has been presented for formative evaluation, prior to implementation, to the judgmental panel of graduate students and teachers, still requires further stages of evaluation. A second stage of formative evaluation should take the form of a descriptive study to be carried out in conjunction with the classroom implementation of the instructional plan. The purpose of this study would be to observe the effectiveness of the suggested classroom procedures for teaching the elements of the historian's method. As a result of these observations any necessary modifications and adjustments could be made to either these planned strategies or to the stated objectives of the unit.

If possible, implementation of the plan should be carried out in several classrooms of varying grade levels in order to determine how applicable the plan's objectives and strategies are for various grade levels. It would also be desirable to observe how the plan is influenced by other variables, including class size and with different teachers.

A summative evaluation which compares the overall value of the teaching of the historical method using this instructional plan with other methods of inquiry, should follow formative evaluation. Some proponents of the acquisition of knowledge through the structures of the disciplines in the 1960's have recently questioned the efficacy of this technique in helping students to deal with the manifest social problems of the late 1960's and early 1970's. Proponents such as Bruner (1971) and Foshay (1970) have suggested that, perhaps, these problems would be better coped with through direct inquiry and social action. Common ground for comparison of these modes of inquiry may be difficult to find. The proposed instructional plan seeks to provide the student with an inquiry tool which is useful for exploring certain types of questions. Bruner and Foshay seem to be more concerned with the kind of question which is explored. This being the case, it is possible that some other type of instruction which is based upon another orientation to the structure of knowledge, should be compared with the one suggested by this instructional plan. Nevertheless, the summative evaluation of this instructional plan should take the form of an experimental study which compares it with another form of instructional orientation as to procedures and objectives.

Teacher Attitudes Towards History and University Instruction

In view of the differences in orientations towards history and the historical method which have been tentatively established as existing between historians and teachers having history majors, further study to confirm or reject this hypothesis and to explore some of its ramifications might be warranted. Questionnaires containing elements of the historical method, such as the one used in this study, might be submitted to a larger sample of teachers and historians. Further questions should be appended to question respondents on their views as to what they perceive the uses of historical knowledge and the historical method of inquiry to be in the secondary school. Teachers might also be asked, on a separate form, to evaluate the adequacy of their university level history courses in preparing them to teach history in the schools.

Teacher Attitudes Towards Externally Developed Instructional Plans

The responses of the teachers as compared with those of the graduate students in judging the teachability of the instructional plan seemed to suggest a possible negative attitude by some teachers towards an instructional plan not developed by themselves. It might be revealing to carry out further studies with teachers concerning their predispositions towards units of study developed by themselves and ones developed by some external source. Such attitudinal studies might be followed up by experimental studies which not only compare the relative effectiveness of teacher-developed and externally-developed instructional units, but which also examine individual teacher predispositions as a determinant of a unit's effectiveness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acton, Lord John. A Lecture on the Study of History, London: Macmillan, 1895.

Ausubel, David P. "Learning by Discovery" Educational Leadership, pp. 113-117, November, 1962.

Barzun, Jacques and Henry Graff. The Modern Researcher, New York: Harbinger Books, 1957.

Beard, Charles A. A Charter for the Social Studies, New York: Scribner's Sons, 1932.

Bloch, Marc. The Historian's Craft, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1954.

Brown, Richard K. "The Historian and New Approaches to History in the Schools", Teacher's College Journal, 72: pp. , September, 1970.

Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Bruner, Jerome S. "The Process of Education Revisited", Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 18-21, September, 1971.

Clark, G. Kitson. The Critical Historian, London: Heinemann, 1967.

Clark, Leonard H. Teaching Social Studies in Secondary Schools: A Handbook. New York: Macmillan, 1973.

Collingwood, R.G. The Idea of History, London: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Commager, Henry S. The Nature and the Study of History, Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1965.

Cox, Benjamin and Byron Massialas. Inquiry in the Social Studies, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Dance, E.H. History the Betrayer: A Study in Bias, (2nd ed.), London: Hutchinson, 1964.

Daniels, Le Roi B. The Justification of Curricula. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, June, 1971.

Eisenberg, John A. "Contemporary History Education: Factors Affecting Its Survival", *Canadian Journal of History and Social Science*, 6: pp. 19-23, March-April 1971.

Elton, G.R. *The Practice of History*, New York: Thomas Crowell, 1967.

Elton, G.R. "What Sort of History Should we Teach". In Martin Ballard (Ed.), *New Movements in the Teaching of History*, London: Temple Smith, 1970, pp. 221-230.

Fenton, Edwin. "Inquiry Techniques in the New Social Studies", *High School Journal* 55: pp. 28-40, October, 1971.

Fenton, Edwin. "Introduction to the Study of History". In Edwin Fenton (Ed.) *Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools*, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Flesch, Rudolf. "Marks of Readable Style". Doctoral Dissertation. New York: Columbia University, 1943.

Foshay, Arthur W. "How Fare the Disciplines?", Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 349-352, March, 1970.

Good, John M. *The Shaping of Western Society: An Inquiry Approach*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Hodgetts, A.B. *What Culture? What Heritage? A Study of Civic Education in Canada*, Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968.

Jarolminek, John. "Rationale for Social Studies Education". In *Guidelines for Elementary Social Studies*, Washington: National Education Association, 1967, pp. 6-27.

Johnson, Henry. *Teaching of History*, (revised ed.), New York: Macmillan, 1940.

Joyce, Bruce and Marsha Weil. *Models of Teaching*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Keddie, Nell. "Classroom Knowledge". For Michael D. Young (Ed.) *Knowledge and Control*, London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

Kellum, David F. *American History Through Conflicting Interpretations*, New York: Teacher's College Press, 1969.

Kellum, David F. Social Studies Myths and Realities, New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research (2nd ed.), New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Krug, Mark. History and the Social Sciences, Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell, 1967.

Lucey, William L. History: Methods and Interpretation, Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1958.

Manson, Gary et. al. "Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines", Social Education 35: pp. 853-869, December, 1971.

McNeil, William. "World History in the Schools". In Martin Ballard (Ed.) New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History, London: Temple Smith, 1970, pp. 16-25.

Morrissett, Irving (Ed.). Concepts and Structure in the New Social Science Curricula, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Nevins, Allan. The Gateway to History (revised ed.), New York: Anchor Books, 1962.

Nugent, Harry H. "History: What Do the Students Want?", Independent School Bulletin, 31: pp. 50-52, May, 1972.

Palmer, John R. "American History: Potential for Inquiry But Little Fulfillment". In Benjamin Cox and Byron Massialas (Eds.), Social Studies in the United States, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967.

Pamar, Baldur. "Effectiveness of the Use of Historical Documents in Teaching Historical Concepts in Social Studies". Unpublished Master's Thesis. Edmonton: The University of Alberta, 1970.

Parker, Cecil J. and Louis J. Rubin. Process as Content, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Postman, Neil and Charles Weingartner. Teaching as a Subversive Activity, New York: Dell Publishing, 1969.

Rojas, Billy. "The End of History", The Social Studies, 63: pp. 118-124, March, 1972.

Rosenthal, Raymond and R.C. Jacobson. Pygmation in the Classroom, New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1968.

Schuyler, Robert L. "Some Historical Idols", Political Science Quarterly, 47: pp. 63-78, March, 1932.

Schwab, Joseph J. "The Concept of the Structure of a Discipline", Educational Record, 43: pp. 197-205, July, 1962.

Sellers, Charles G. "Is History on the Way Out of Schools and Do HIstorians Care?", Social Education, 33: pp. 509-513, May, 1969.

Shermis, Samuel S. "Six Myths Which Delude History Teachers", Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 9-12, September, 1967.

Trevelyan, George M. "History and the Reader" in George M. Trevelyan, An Autobiography and Other Essays, London: Longmans, 1969, pp. 59-66.

Trueman, John H. "End of an Era: History in Canadian Secondary Schools", The History Teacher, 2: pp. 29-32, November, 1968.

Walsh, Gerald. "A Survey of Philosophies of History in Canadian High Schools", Canadian Journal of History and Social Science 2: pp. 8-14, 1966-1967.

Ward, Paul L. "Why History?", High School Journal, 55: 1-10, October, 1971.

Wickenden, Nicholas. What is HIstory? An Inquiry Approach. Paper presented at the Alberta Conference on Social Studies, June, 1967.

Wood, John S. "A Plea for Learning to Look Historically" in Independent School Bulletin, 31: pp. 48-49, May, 1972.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ON ELEMENTS OF THE HISTORICAL METHOD

February 25, 1974

Dear Respondent:

Enclosed with this letter is a set of statements which, in the opinion of some historians, represent elements of the historical method. It is planned to use these elements of the historian's method in developing an instructional plan for teaching history to secondary school students. This instructional plan will have a twofold purpose; firstly, it will teach the student how a historian might inquire into the past and secondly, it will enable the student to employ this method of inquiry in solving a historical problem.

Before developing the above mentioned instructional plan, it has been thought necessary to have these statements validated by historians as being elements of the historical method. You are asked, therefore, to indicate whether you agree or disagree with each statement. If you should like to qualify or elaborate on your agreement or disagreement, please feel free to use the spaces provided for further comments.

If you should require further clarification of this request, you may contact me at 432-5347.

Yours sincerely,

Terrance R. Carson,
M.Ed. Candidate,
Department of Secondary Education

ELEMENTS OF THE HISTORICAL METHOD

The following statements are intended to display elements of the historian's method of research and writing. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement as to whether or not it constitutes an activity of the historical method in your opinion. Feel free to elaborate on or qualify your response to a given statement in the space provided.

A. Objectives of the Historical Method:

1. Although a past event may never be perfectly reconstructed, the goal of the historian is to try to discover, as nearly as possible, past actuality. (Collingwood, p. 5; Krug, p. 12)

   Agree______ Disagree______

   Comment (if any)

2. The focus of historical, as opposed to other types of social scientific inquiry, is upon the interpretation of a unique event or series of events, rather than formulating generalizations regarding human behaviour. (Trevelyan, p. 62)

   Agree______ Disagree______

   Comment (if any)

B. Locating an Historical Problem:

1. Historical inquiry begins when some event, development or experience in the past is questioned, either as a result of new data coming to light or through a reinterpretation of old data. From a general feeling of difficulty with the problem, the historian isolates the crucial points that give rise to his initial doubts. (Collingwood, p. 9)

   Agree______ Disagree______

   Comment (if any)

2. Secondary source material often serves to acquaint the uninitiated historian with the major theoretical issues in a particular area of history. (Elton, p. 66)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

C. Developing a Hypothesis:

1. After defining the problem and carrying out preliminary research, the historian develops a hypothesis (tentative conclusion) which he seeks to prove or disprove through more extensive research. (Nevins, p. 234)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

2. In developing a hypothesis the historian recognizes that ready acceptance of one single hypothesis tends to lead to an over simplified answer to a historical problem. (Nevins, p. 243)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

D. Gathering Source Materials:

1. Before proceeding with extensive inquiry into a problem, the historian checks the availability of data. (Barzun and Graff, p. 23; Lucey, p. 22)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

2. Generally speaking, the historian endeavours to seek evidence from the closest witness to a past event (primary sources) in order to minimize distortion of past reality. (Nevins, p. 195)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

3. Well-documented secondary source material often serves to introduce the historian to available primary source material. (Clark, p. 128)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

E. Criticizing Source Materials:

1. Detecting whether a document contains unintentional errors or is a deliberate deception is an essential part of a historian's work. (Bloch, p. 62)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

2. The historian generally questions the origin of his source materials before establishing the meaning and trustworthiness of the data itself. (Elton, p. 74)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

3. A report or story regarding a particular historical event, which appears a long time after the occurence, should be validated against evidence given at the time of the event. (Nevins, p. 224)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

4. A historian attempts to ascertain how familiar the author of a source is with the event he reports, ie. did his information come from direct observation, heresay, borrowed source materials, etc. (Nevins, p. 195)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

5. The historian endeavours to discover whether or not an author of a source was considered to be a competent observer by his contemporaries in order to evaluate the worth of that document as a piece of evidence. (Nevins, p. 197)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

6. The historian attempts to uncover the motivation behind the production of a certain document in evaluating the worth of that document as a piece of evidence. (Elton, p. 69)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

7. Accounts of the same event by two independent and competent observers are sought after by historians in order to verify the testimony given by a particular observer. (Nevins, p. 225)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

8. An historian attempts to interpret the meaning of a primary source with reference to the then contemporary ideals and concepts. He realizes that the imposition of modern ideals and concepts on the past may cause him to misinterpret the intent of that source. (Acton, p. 65; Schuyler, p. 15)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

F. Synthesis of Validated Historical Data:

1. After the historian gathers and criticizes his data, he refers to his hypothesis and determines what information would be significant in proving the hypothesis. (Nevins, p. 238)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

2. After he has criticized his data, the historian evaluates and rates his sources from most believable to least believable. (Clark, p. 127)

Agree______ Disagree______

Comment (if any)

3. Once the historian has determined the significance and the credibility of his sources, he proceeds to reconstruct the historical event. (Krug, p. 12)

Agree______ Disagree__✓___

Comment (if any)

Bibliography

Acton, Lord John. A Lecture on the Study of History (London: MacMillan and Co., 1895).

Barzun, Jacques and Graff, Henry. The Modern Researcher (New York: Harbinger Books, 1957).

Bloch, Marc. The Historian's Craft (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1954).

Clark, G. Kitson. "The Scholarly Attitude" in The Critical Historian (London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1967).

Collingwood, R.G. The Idea of History (London: Oxford University Press, 1946).

Elton, G.R. The Practice of History (New York: Thomas J. Crowell, 1967).

Krug, Mark. History and the Social Sciences (Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1967).

Lucey, William Leo. History: Methods and Interpretation (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1958).

Nevins, Allan. The Gateway to History (New York: Anchor Books, 1962).

Schuyler, Robert Livingston. "Some Historical Idols", Political Science Quarterly, vol. 47, no. 1.

Trevelyan, G.M. Clio, A Muse and Other Essays (London: Longmans, Green, 1914).

APPENDIX B

ARTICLES FOR REQUIRED STUDENT READING

England During the Wars of the Roses

The reign of Richard III is the culmination of a turbulent phase of England's history extending from the late fourteenth century to the end of the fifteenth century. In the declining years of Edward III (1327-1377), English success in the war against France turned sour, and as the old king sank into senility, his sons took up a struggle for power which ended at Bosworth Field. Edward's grandson and successor, Richard II (1377-1399), was unable to maintain himself against baronial machinations and fell before a revolt which placed Henry of Lancaster on the throne. Richard did not long survive his deposition. The new Lancastrian, Henry IV (1399-1413), beat the baronial factions into submission; his son Henry V (1413-1422) led his countrymen to victory at Agincourt and won tenuous control of northern France before his untimely death. Henry VI (1422-1461) inherited the crown as an infant; dependent on his uncles during his minority, the feeble Henry never controlled his realm of England and soon lost his lands in France. Military defeat and national humiliation, governmental inefficiency and bankruptcy, and the unpopularity of Henry's long-fruitless marriage to the French princess Margaret of Anjou led to open conflict between the supporters of the king and those of Richard, Duke of York, who claimed the crown in his own right. In 1455 began the civil war known as the War of the Roses - the red rose of Lancaster and the white rose of York. Richard of York was killed early in the strife, but his eldest son, Edward, supported by Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick ("the Kingmaker") overcame all opposition and secured the crown in 1461 as Edward IV.

The triumphant Yorkists were shortly at odds with one another. Warwick, antagonized by the marriage of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville (1464) at the very moment when he was negotiating for a royal marriage in France, turned against the king. With the aid of France, Margaret of Anjou (whose son, the Prince of Wales, was betrothed to Warwick's daughter Anne), and Edward's brother George, Duke of Clarence (who was also Warwick's son-in-law), the Kingmaker deposed the Yorkist king in 1470 and restored Henry VI. Edward and his loyal brother, Richard of Gloucester, escaped to Burgundy. Returning to England in 1471, they persuaded Clarence to betray Warwick, and in a brief, brilliant campaign the Yorkists defeated Warwick at Barnet and Margaret at Tewkesbury. The Lancastrian Prince of Wales was killed in the latter engagement, and as soon as Edward and Richard secured the Tower of London, they announced that poor Henry VI had died "of pure displeasure and melancholy."

From 1471 to 1483, Edward IV governed England with a firm hand. He was popular notwithstanding his many amours, and save for the jealous rivalry between the older nobility and Queen Elizabeth's Woodville relatives, the nation seemed well settled. "False, fleeting, perjured Clarence" met a not altogether undeserved end in 1478, attainted of high treason. All was upset, however, by Edward's unexpected death in 1483, while he was yet in the prime of life.

Once more England faced the dangers of a royal minority. Edward V was only twelve years old, and the nobles would inevitably fight for control of his government; no promises to a dead king could bind them. The Woodvilles formed a party - the Queen Mother, Elizabeth; her brother, Earl Rivers; and her son, the Marquis Dorset. Richard of Gloucester opposed them. Great barons like Buckingham, Hastings, and Stanley had to find their way between these rival forces or perish. And across the Channel in France, young Henry Tudor was patiently awaiting the outcome of events.

From Littleton, Taylor and Rea, Robert R. To Prove a Villain, New York: MacMillan, 1964.

The Murder of the Princes

One of the best known and most moving stories connected with the Tower is that of the two princes, Edward V and his younger brother, Richard Duke of York; and one of the wickedest uncles in history is surely Richard Duke of Gloucester, afterwards Richard III. Shakespeare says so, taking his information from Sir Thomas More's *Historie of Kyng Rycharde the Thirde*, written about 1513. Contemporary opinion very generally suspected a double murder and modern research tends to confute apologists for the victim of a thoroughly bad press. Indeed, the only problem seems to be whether Richard was 'putte in hope by the occasion of the tender age of the younge Princes his Nephues, as opportunitye and lykelyhoode of spede putteth a manne in courage of that hee never entended', or whether 'he long time in king Edwardes life forethought to be king'.[1]

By April 1483 Edward IV knew that he would die. His son was only twelve. There was jealousy and enmity between his wife's relations, the Woodvilles, and the rest of the nobility in the government, who despised them as upstarts and feared that they would dominate the young prince in order to aggrandize themselves further. It was held significant that the prince's household and council in Wales, where he was at that time, were entirely directed and controlled by Anthony Woodville, Earl of Rivers, the queen's brother.

The Duke of Gloucester was also a member of the prince's council, but his duties as Great Chamberlain of England, Admiral of England, Ireland and Aquitaine, Warden of the West Marches against Scotland and Lieutenant General of the North, prevented close attendance on his nephew. He had recently conducted a successful campaign against Scotland. His rule of the north was regarded as just and he had many supporters among the people of those parts. He had always been loyal to his brother, King Edward, throughout the ups and downs of a difficult reign. The king intended to entrust him with his son's guardianship. It was obviously impossible to pass over a man of his standing, nor was there any reason for doing so.

---

[1] More, op. cit.

II

This, of course, would make the Woodville party very discontented and the king was anxious for the future. Previously, 'albeit that this discencion beetwene hys frendes sommewhat yrked hym, yet in his good health he sommewhat the lesse regarded it, because hee thought whatsoever business shoulde falle betwene them, hymselfe should alwaye bee hable to rule bothe the partyes'.[1] But it was not so certain that they would submit themselves to his brother and he was afraid that the country might slip back into the anarchy of the Wars of the Roses. Propping himself up with pillows, he called the lords into his room and begged them[2] for the sake of his children, for peace and the good of the kingdom, to put aside selfish feelings and work together. Overcome by emotion, with tears in their eyes, they swore that they would. 'And therewithal the king no longer enduring to sitte up, laide him down',[3] and, on April 9th, he died.

The news was sent to the prince at Ludlow and the council met in London. The queen who intended, if possible, to head the new government, wished the young king to come up to London with a strong retinue and be crowned at once. Lord Hastings, however, by a mixture of strenuous arguments and threats managed to persuade them to cut the escort down to two thousand men. The more prudent members of the council, says the contemporary *Croyland Chronicle*, thought the queen's relations were not suitable guardians for the prince. They respected the late king's wishes and were determined to carry them out, although they agreed that Edward V should be crowned as soon as possible, and May 4th was fixed. This meant that he would have the right to choose his advisers.

At about the same time, the Marquis of Dorset, taking men and money from the Tower, fitted out a naval squadron and set sail, ostensibly in pursuit of a French pirate.

---

[1] More.

[2] Especially Lord Hastings, Chamberlain and Captain of Calais, an influential grandee, not of the Woodville party, and the Marquis of Dorset, the queen's son by a former marriage, who commanded the Tower. The Duke of Gloucester was in Yorkshire.

[3] More.

Meanwhile the Duke of Gloucester did nothing which could possibly be construed as a plot to seize the throne. He wrote to the queen assuring her of his loyalty to the new king and promising to come to London immediately. Arriving at York, dressed in mourning, he had a funeral mass performed. He then took the oath of fealty to Edward V and obliged the local nobility to do the same.

Continuing south, he met the Duke of Buckingham, his closest supporter, at Northampton on the very day[1] that the king, conducted by Lord Rivers, the queen's brother, arrived from Wales at Stony Stratford, ten miles away. Lord Rivers came over to pay his respects to the dukes and a cheerful supper party was held. But, after Rivers had gone to bed, the two dukes spent the rest of the night debating the position with their friends. They must have considered the news from London and the probability that the queen's party would not allow the king to pass into Gloucester's care without a fight. The chance appeared to get possession of the king's person. They resolved to take the opportunity.

The story now takes a violent, but not necessarily a sinister, turn. In the morning they arrested Lord Rivers, 'and that done, foorthwyth wente to horsebacke, and tooke the waye to Stonye Stratforde'.[2] There, kneeling very respectfully before the young king, they accused his half-brothers, Lord Grey and the Marquis of Dorset of a plot against them. The king tried to protest, but Lord Grey, who was present, and other chief noblemen of the household, were arrested and the retinue replaced by the dukes' men. Edward was very much upset and cried, though his uncle assured him that everything was done for his own safety and treated him with the greatest propriety.

When the queen, who was in the palace of Westminster, heard what had happened, she was terrified: she had engaged in an unsuccessful conspiracy to exclude her brother-in-law from the government; her brother and one of her sons had been arrested and sent to the north country. With her children, the Duke of York and his five sisters, she fled to sanctuary in Westminster.[3] All night the removal went on: men hurried backwards and forwards with chests, coffers, packages of every sort, and even broke down the wall between the palace and the sanctuary to make a short cut for the heavier loads. In the middle of everything 'the Quene her self satte alone alowe on the rushes all desolate and dismayde'.[1] The Archbishop of York, roused from his bed, tried to comfort her as best he could but she only replied" 'Hee is one of them that laboureth to destroy me and my bloode.'[1]

---

[1] 29 April 1483.

[2] More.

[3] The abbot had special lodgings which he let out.

In the city, too, there was a great commotion. People put on their armour and next morning,[2] says the *Croyland Chronicle*, some gathered at Westminster in the queen's name and others in London under the shadow of Lord Hastings. No one quite knew what was happening. The council met and Lord Hastings, 'whose trouth towarde the king no manne doubted nor neded to doubte'[3] explained that the arrests had been made because of a plot against the Dukes of Gloucester and Buckingham. He added that as the dukes would soon arrive with the king, they could answer for their actions and the matter be properly investigated.

On May 4th, the very day when the Woodvilles had hoped to see the king crowned and themselves installed as his council, the royal party reached Harringay, north of the city. The mayor went out to meet them, 'beynge clothed in scarlet and the cytezeyns in vyolet, to the nombre of v hondred horses'.[4] The little king wore blue velvet and Gloucester was in black. As the procession rode towards London, it was particularly noticed that the duke treated the king with reverence and respect. Also displayed was the great quantity of arms which had been found in the king's baggage. When the common people saw this they were very indignant and said hanging was too good for Lord Rivers and his crew.

The king's journey ended at the bishop's palace in St. Paul's, where 'all the lords, spiritual and temporal, and the mayor and aldermen',[5] took the oath of fealty.

---

[1] More.

[2] May 2nd.

[3] More.

[4] Fabyan *Chronicle*, ed. Ellis, 1811.

[5] *Chronicle of Croyland*, trs. by Riley, 1854.

The Duke of Gloucester was now extremely popular. It was felt that he had saved the king and the country. The council met and solemnly confirmed him in the office of protector, with authority equal to the king's. Besides being acclaimed in London, he had the north at his command. This made him the most powerful man in England. The temptation to try for something more permanent than the protectorship may have presented itself to him at this time.

For the moment, however, everything seemed to be going splendidly. The coronation was fixed for June 22nd. Lord Hastings, as the *Croyland Chronicle* tells us, congratulated himself on having helped to transfer the government without so much blood being spilt as would 'be produced by a cut finger'. It was true that the queen remained firmly in sanctuary, her friends and relations in prison, and her son, the Marquis of Dorset, continued to cruise about in the Channel. These were small matters compared with the crisis which had been overcome.

The question arose as to where the king should live until his coronation. Some thought Westminster would be best and some the Priory of the Hospitallers of St. John at Clerkenwell. But the Duke of Buckingham proposed the palace in the Tower and as no one could make any valid objection, he carried the day. Writs were issued to summon a parliament for June 25th and a squadron was ordered to go out after the Marquis of Dorset.

During May, while preparations for the coronation went on and everyone looked forward to a long and prosperous reign for the young king, the services of the Duke of Buckingham, Gloucester's chief supporter, were so very amply rewarded as to suggest that he was being paid in advance for the vital part he was to play in designs now beginning to take shape in Gloucester's mind. The accession of Edward V had left the principality of Wales vacant and the whole of it was quickly handed over to Buckingham. Between May 15th and 22nd he became ruler of North and South Wales and the countries of Salop, Hereford, Somerset, Dorset and Wiltshire. He commanded all the royal castles in this area, received all the fees from manors, lordships, forests and parks, and was made Chief Justice of Wales, with the right to raise an army, if he thought fit.[1]

This gave Lord Hastings pause. He had been concerned from the fir[illegible] to see the late king's wishes carried out. Richard of Gloucester was, he had agreed, the right man to be protector, and he had supported him hitherto, having no real reason to suspect that he had ulterior motives. But now the overwhelming strength of the two dukes, together with certain rumours which began to reach him of Gloucester's designs, alarmed him. He began to think that the young king's safety lay rather in a balance between the two parties than in the total suppression of the one and the too large authority of the other. Not understanding that it was now over-late to seek this middle way, for Duke Richard had become too strong, he made overtures to the Woodvilles.

---

[1] See J.G. Nichols, *Grants from the Crown during the Reign of Edward V*, 1854.

A curious development now ensued. While the council proper met in the Tower with the king, the two dukes and their friends began holding independent meetings at Crosby's Place in Bishopsgate Street, where Gloucester was living. Hastings employed a spy, in whom he had every confidence, to report on what was discussed there. Being fully informed, as he thought, says More, he was not at all uneasy. But the spy was playing false. He had gone over to Gloucester's side and not only made no report of what he heard of his plans, but betrayed to him Hastings' approach to the Woodvilles.

Outwardly, however, all was still well. The two dukes 'made very good semblaunce unto the Lord Hastinges, and kept him much in company'.[1] Nor were they altogether hypocritical. 'Undoubtedly the protectour loved him wel', says More. But he was a ruthless man, as events were soon to show. If Hastings got in the way, he would have to be removed.

Gloucester found it impossible to reassure the queen, whom he wished to entice out of sanctuary so that she would be more in his power. In spite of 'some manner of muttering amonge the people',[1] caused by her position and the double councils, preparations for the coronation went on, 'which men demed to have been (for) theldest son of kyng Edward the iiiith'.[2] 'Pageauntes and suttelties were in making day and night at Westminister';[3] provisions were laid in; on June 5th the little king wore a letter, ordering those who were to be made knights at the coronation to present themselves. He must have been looking forward to the festivities and excitement. There is no record of his having gone out of the Tower during these weeks. It seems that he was not allowed even a trip up the river in his barge.

---

[1] More.

[2] *Chronicles of London*, ed. C.L. Kingsford, 1905.

[3] More.

London was full of visitors. On June 9th Simon Stallworthe, a clerk in the chancery, writing on business to Sir William Stonor in Oxfordshire, gives the chat of the day.[1] Come to London, he says, 'and ye schall knoue all the world'. The Duchess of Gloucester has arrived. There is 'gret besyness ageyns ye coronacion wyche shal be this day fortnyght as we say'. The Marquis of Dorset's goods are being confiscated and the Abbot of Westminster 'is in gret trobyll' because he is keeping some of them.[2] The protector, he adds, and the whole council had a long session at Westminster, but nobody went to speak 'with the Quene'.

Richard had given up trying to persuade her to leave. After this meeting he felt strong enough to precipitate the crisis. On June 10th and 11th, he wrote two letters to his supporters in the north ordering them to come to him with as many armed men as possible. Events moved swiftly and no one was left in doubt as to his designs on the throne.

On June 13th, he appeared suddenly in the council chamber at the Tower, 'with a wonderful soure angrye countanaunce',[3] and made wild accusations of plots against his life, and of treason and sorcery, in order to pick a quarrel with Lord Hastings. Having worked himself into a great rage, he banged his fist on the table, which was the signal for his followers to rush in and arrest all those present who upheld the young king's rights. Lord Hastings, as the leader, was immediately dragged out to the green 'where the chapell of the Tower standeth' and on a log' whiche there laye with other for the repayrynge of the sayd Tower,'[4] he was beheaded, 'incontynently withowth process of any law or lawful examynacion'.[1] 'And thus was this noble man murderid ffor his trowth and ffidelyte which he ffermly bare unto hys mastyr'.[2]

---

[1] For this letter see p. 16 of *Excerpta Historica*, ed. S. Bentley, 1831.

[2] Perhaps they were part of the luggage the queen was so anxious to transfer to sanctuary.

[3] More.

[4] Fabyan.

When the townspeople heard what had happened, says Mancini, an Italian in London at the time, they did not know what to make of it and seized their weapons. But the duke sent a herald to proclaim that a conspiracy, led by Hastings, had been discovered in the Tower. The ignorant believed this, although the more thoughtful said at once that the plot was Richard's own invention and, adds the *Great Chronicle*, 'then was pryvy talkyng in London that the lord Protectour shuld be kyng'.

It seems as if the idea of a usurpation was not altogether disagreeable to the citizens. Although shocked by Lord Hastings' death, they did not try to avenge him. Perhaps they thought it would be better to have an effective king than a minor, whatever the strictly legal aspect might be. They were business people and a capable administrator and order in the city would serve their interests best. Or, perhaps, they were overcome by the speed of events. 'I hold you happy that ye ar oute of the prese,' wrote Simon Stallworthe to Sir William on June 21st, 'for with huse is myche trobull and every manne dowtes other.' All Lord Hastings' retainers have taken service with the Duke of Buckingham. It is rumoured that an army of twenty thousand men will be in London within a week.[3] He also reports the taking of the young Duke of York from sanctuary.

At a meeting of the council on the 16th, Gloucester had prevailed on the Archbishop of Canterbury to go and persuade the queen to give up her son. The archbishop agreed, says Mancini, in the belief that no harm would come to the boy and in the hope that he could prevent a violation of the sanctuary. For it had been decided that the child should be removed by force, if necessary. The queen was very unwilling to part with him. He had been ill, she said, and needed his mother. How could she know what their wicked uncle would do when he had her two boys in his power? It was ridiculous to say that the king must have his brother to play with, or that the little duke was kept in sanctuary against his will. But nothing she said had any effect.

---

[1] *The Great Chronicle of London*, ed. A.H. Thomas, 1938.

[2] Ibid.

[3] This was a greatly exaggerated figure. Four or five thousand arrived about June 26th.

Westminster was surrounded by armed men. The protector was waiting impatiently in the Starchamber. She saw that the child would have to go. So, trusting to the archbishop's earnest assurance that everything would be all right, she handed him over as cheerfully as she could.

The archbishop conducted him to Westminster Hall, where the Duke of Buckingham received him with respect, and Gloucester, standing at the door of the Starchamber, embraced him most affectionately. The young prince was then taken to his brother 'where bothe were well entreatid wythyn the kyngys lodgyng beyng withyn the Towyr'.[1] They were not seen outside the walls again.

As yet, Gloucester had not openly claimed the throne. In order to prepare the way and impress the people with his magnificence, he took off the black clothes he had worn since his brother's death and put on purple robes. He rode about the streets, accompanied by a large and brilliant retinue. But, Mancini tells us, the citizens did not gather in crowds and cheer his passing, as expected. The coronation had been postponed until November and the fixing of such a distant date confirmed men's suspicions that the young king would never be crowned.

In spite of the lack of enthusiasm, there were no actual demonstrations against the protector and his plan went forward smoothly enough. On Sunday, June 22nd, at Paul's Cross, Dr. Shaw, the mayor's brother, preached on the text 'Bastard slips shall not take deep root'. Having illuminated the principle with various examples from the Old Testament, he said that the only legitimate heir to the throne was the Duke of Gloucester. All the late king's children, he declared, were bastards because their father was not lawfully married to the queen, having been previously betrothed to Lady Eleanor Butler, daughter of the Earl of Shrewsbury.[2] Further, said the doctor, warming to his theme, the duke's mother had been far from virtuous and the only one of her sons who could be said to belong to her husband was Richard of Gloucester. One could prove it simply by looking at him. He was the exact image of his father.

---

[1] *The Great Chronicle.*

[2] In medieval times, a couple formally betrothed were regarded as married, and lived as man and wife, whether or not they were subsequently married in church.

At this point it had been arranged that Richard should accidentally appear on the scene, as if the preacher had been inspired to speak of him by 'the Holye Ghost'.[1] However, as he had loitered on the way, so as not to be too early, and Dr. Shaw had hurried so as not to be behindhand, the moment passed without the miraculous vision. Shortly afterwards, the sermon having gone on to other matters, he saw the duke majestically approach and was obliged, 'without ani deduccion therunto out of al order, and oute of al frame', abruptly to declaim, as Richard went through the crowd: 'This is the father's own figure, this his own countenance, the very printe of his visage, the sure undoubted ymage, the plain expresse lykeness of the noble duke.[2]

But the people, instead of shouting 'King Richard! King Richard!' and throwing up their caps in an excess of joy, as intended, remained absolutely mute, astonished that Dr. Shaw should 'take upon hym suche a besyness, consyderynge that he was so famous a man, both of his learnynge and also of naturall wytte'.[3]

Though not acclaimed, Richard had not been disclaimed and, two days later, the Duke of Buckingham set out for the Guildhall to try to persuade the people to display a little enthusiasm. He was 'of nature marveilouslye well spoken'[4] and standing on the platform with the mayor and aldermen behind him and the commonalty gathered in front, he gave an oration which, says the *Great Chronicle*, 'lastid a good half howyr and was soo well and eloquently uttyrd and with soo angelyk a countenance ... that such as hard him mervaylid.'[5] Nevertheless, when at the end they were asked to declare Richard their king, there was dead silence, 'wherewith the duke was mervailously abashed',[6] and asked the mayor what was the meaning of it. He replied that he thought the people couldn't have understood properly.

---

[1] More.

[2] Of York, Gloucester's father. He was killed in battle during the Wars of the Roses, so never became king.

[3] Fabyan.

[4] More.

[5] In addition to the question of Edward V's illegitimacy, he laid stress on Gloucester's reputation for just and firm government.

[6] More.

So the duke began again, speaking louder and using simpler language. The audience admired his delivery extremely. Never had they 'in their lives heard so evill a tale so well tolde'.[1] But when he stopped, 'al was as styl as the midnight'.[2] The duke became impatient. The mayor quickly said that the people were not accustomed to be spoken to except by the recorder of the city. The recorder tried, with no better result. Buckingham, very angry, shouted that they must say something, one way or the other. Then at last the people 'to satysfye his myend more ffor ffere than ffor love, cryed in small numbir, ye, ye'.[3]

On the next day, June 25th, parliament assembled. Technically it was not a valid meeting because, at some point in the conspiracy, writs cancelling the summons had been despatched, perhaps by the Hastings party. Not all the cancellations were received in time and there was a sufficient attendance. Buckingham seems not to have had much difficulty in persuading members to accept a petition setting out the reasons why Richard ought to be king and begging him to assume the crown.

A deputation, led by Buckingham and joined by the mayor and aldermen, went at once to Gloucester's house and called for him to come out to them. With an air of great surprise, says More, he came on to a balcony and asked what they wanted. Buckingham read the petition, but Gloucester said he couldn't possibly grant it because he had taken the oath to Edward V and ill-informed people would think he had seized the throne from ambition. But Buckingham, in the name of them all, besought him to reconsider. Then Gloucester said that since they insisted, and since they represented London and the whole country, he must submit to their will. At this there were shouts of 'King Richard! King Richard!' and a cloud of caps flew into the air.

From that moment he called himself Richard III. A 'mockishe eleccion', says More derisively. Yet he had been elected. No one felt strongly enough to fight for the young prince. The people of London, though they did not approve of the usurpation, were evidently ready to accept a *fait accompli*. We hear of no riots, no demonstrations, only of grumbling and muttering among the citizens. Everybody seems to have known the truth of the matter from beginning to end. No one was taken in for more than a moment by any of the reasons put forward in support of Richard's legal claims. They must have thought that it was better to let him be king so that the government could settle down at last. Indeed, Richard's first act was to promise them this very thing. He went to Westminster Hall and, sitting on the king's bench, called the judges before him and publicly ordered them to do strict and prompt justice to every man, without discrimination. It was the chief duty of a king, he said, to administer the law.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] *The Great Chronicle.*

The rightful king's palace in the Tower now turned into a prison. Edward was still childish enough to be seen, several times, running about with his brother on the Tower green, playing with his bow and arrows, but he was clever and thoughtful beyond his years. He could understand and discuss any work, verse or prose, says Mancini, unless it was particularly difficult. His slight figure was dignified, his manner charming. He was good-looking, in spite of an infection he had in his teeth, which gave him permanently sore gums and must have had a debilitating effect on his general health and spirits.

When the news of the usurpation was brought to him, he felt, instinctively, that his life was in danger. Nothing his attendants said to comfort him lifted his despair and he began to neglect his appearance. His fears were soon justified. With his brother, he was taken from the royal apartments and shut up in a stronger part of the fortress, perhaps the White Tower. His servants were not allowed to visit him. He confessed daily and sought remission of his sins in preparation for death. But what sins can this sad child have committed?

At first the two boys were to be seen looking out through bars and windows. They may have watched the coronation procession of their uncle on July 6th, which was of great magnificence and utilized all the robes and trappings ordered for Edward. Gradually they were seen less and less often and, at last, they disappeared.

More gives the only circumstantial account of their murder and his story has been discounted as altogether too fantastic and unlikely. Modern research, however, has confirmed the basic facts he tells, though not the many details with which he embellishes them.[1]

---

[1] See *Recent Investigations regarding the Fate of the Princess in the Tower* by L.E. Tanner and W. Wright in *Archaeologia*, vol. LXXXIV.

Immediately after his coronation Richard III set out on a progress through his new kingdom. He was well received everywhere and by the end of July had reached Gloucester. Here the Duke of Buckingham said good-bye and went on into Wales, and here the king, according to More, suddenly decided to have the princes murdered. Did he suspect that Buckingham might turn against him and raise a rebellion in the name of Edward V? For this was what afterwards happened. He must have known perfectly well what sort of man Buckingham was. But, since he took no steps to secure the duke, he cannot really have believed that he had anything to fear from his firmest friend.

Whatever his reasons for deciding at this moment to do away with the two princes, he sent a message to Sir Robert Brackenbury, constable of the Tower, ordering him to kill them. The messenger found Brackenbury kneeling before the altar in the chapel and then and there, it seems, delivered the king's letter. The constable replied that he would have nothing to do with such a business. The man returned with this answer to the king who had now moved on to Warwick.

Richard, though rather put out, understood Brackenbury well enough and sent back to say that it was only necessary to give up the keys of the Tower for one night. He need not do, or know, anything more. The constable, therefore, handed the keys to the appointed murderers and turned his attention to other matters. They, then, about midnight, crept into the princes' room and 'sodainly lapped them up among the clothes, so bewrapped them and entangled them, keping down by force the fetherbed and pillowes hard unto their mouthes, that within a while smored and stifled, theyr breath failing, thei gave up to God their innocent soules'.[1] When they were quite sure that the children were dead, they put the bodies, one on top of the other, into a wooden chest and buried them 'at the stayre foote ... under a great heape of stones'.[2]

For a short time, the crime remained a secret. But in October, Buckingham raised a rebellion the object of which, the common people understood, was to liberate the princes. At this point rumours of their death began to circulate, perhaps deliberately spread by the king in order to discourage the disturbances.[3] Everyone was horrified and amazed. No one thought they had died naturally. The Death of the Innocents, it was called. People burst into tears in the streets. Nobody knew exactly what had happened. Had they been drowned, poisoned, suffocated? Only one thing was certain: their uncle was a murderer. They would as soon be French, men said passionately, as be subject to such a creature.

---

[1] More.

[2] Ibid.

[3] He crushed the rebellion and beheaded Buckingham, who must have known of the murder, because his real object was to put the future Henry VII on the throne.

The condemnation was universal. For this cause, say the chroniclers, King Richard lost the hearts of the people. There had been usurpations before. There had been murders of reigning kings. But never had two children been cold-bloodedly put to death by a near relative, simply to avoid possible complications.

Where were the corpses? Were they in a secret room in the Tower? Or put into some out-of-the-way hole in the grounds? Or weighted and thrown into a deep part of the river? Everybody had a theory that could not be proved, or disproved. Interest was intense and continued through the centuries. In 1647 someone declared that he knew a man who swore that he had seen the secret room and, in it, a table and, on it, two skeletons. Unfortunately neither room nor bones could be found again. Another time great excitement was caused by the discovery of a small skeleton in a turret which, being very inaccessible, was hardly ever visited. But it turned out to be an ape, escaped, presumably, from the Lion Tower.

Finally in 1674 some workmen demolishing an old staircase that led from the White Tower to the adjoining King's Lodging, came on the wooden chest, under the heap of stones, However, they noticed nothing in particular. It seemed to be just an old box of bones and they threw it on top of the rest of the debris. Luckily, someone in authority heard about it, guessed what it might be and made the labourers sift the rubbish until they had recovered the, by now, damaged chest.

Charles II's principal surgeon examined the remains and declared them to be those of two brothers of more or less the same age as the princes were said to have been. The findings were accepted and Sir Christopher Wren was ordered to design a suitable monument. This he did and the bones were reinterred in Westminster Abbey.

In 1933 it was decided to open the tomb and examine the remains with all the aids of modern science. Charles II's surgeon was fully confirmed in his diagnosis. The remains were found to be those of two brothers of exactly the princes' age. There was even a bloodstain on one of the skulls, consistent with death by suffocation. No other brothers are known to have died in the Tower and been buried under a staircase. Thus the sad mystery was finally cleared up.[1]

---

[1] For an exhaustive discussion of the subject see the above cited article by L.F. Tanner and W. Wright in *Archaeologia* LXXXIV.

From Collis, Louise, Seven in the Tower, London: Faber, 1958.

'Well,' said Marta when she came again, 'what did you think of my woolly lamb?'

'It was *very* kind of you to find him for me.'

'I didn't have to find him. He's continually underfoot. He practically lives at the theatre. He must have seen *To Sea in a Bowl* five hundred times; when he isn't in Atlanta's dressing-room he's in front. I wish they'd get married, and then we might see less of him. (They're not even living together, you know. It's all pure idyll.') She dropped her 'actress' voice for a moment and said: 'They're rather sweet together. In some ways they are more like twins than lovers. They have that utter trust in each other; that dependence on the other half to make a proper whole. And they never have rows - or even quarrels, that I can see. An idyll, as I said. Was it Brent who brought you this?'

She poked the solid bulk of Oliphant with a doubtful finger.

'Yes, he left it with the porter for me.'

'It looks very indigestible.'

'A bit unappetising, let us say. It is quite easily digested once you have swallowed it. History for the student. Set out in detailed fact.'

'Ugh!'

'At least I've discovered where the revered and sainted Sir Thomas More got his account of Richard.'

'Yes? Where?'

'From one John Morton.'

'Never heard of him.'

'Neither did I, but that's our ignorance.'

'Who was he?'

'He was Henry VII's Archbishop of Canterbury. And Richard's bitterest enemy.'

If Marta had been capable of whistling, she would have whistled in comment.

'So *that* was the horse's mouth!' she said.

'That was the horse's mouth. And it is on that account of Richard that all the later ones were built. It is on that story that Holinshed fashioned his history, and on that story that Shakespeare fashioned his character.'

'So it is the version of someone who hated Richard. I didn't know that. Why did the sainted Sir Thomas report Morton rather than someone else?'

'Whoever he reported, it would be a Tudor version. But he reported Morton, it seems, because he had been in Morton's household as a boy. And of course Morton had been very much "on in the act", so it was natural to write down the version of an eyewitness whose account he could have at first hand.'

Marta poked her finger at Oliphant again. 'Does your dull fat historian acknowledge that it is a biased version?'

'Oliphant? Only by implication. He is, to be honest, in a sad muddle himself about Richard. On the same page he says that he was an admirable administrator and general, with an excellent reputation, staid and good-living, very popular by contrast with the Woodville upstarts (the Queen's relations) and that he was "perfectly unscrupulous and ready to wade through any depth of bloodshed to the crown which lay within his grasp". On one page he says grudgingly: "There are reasons for supposing that he was not destitute of a conscience" and then on a later page reports More's picture of a man so tormented by his own deed that he could not sleep. And so on.'

'Does your dull fat Oliphant prefer his roses red, then?'

'Oh, I don't think so. I don't think he is consciously Lancastrian. Though now that I think of it he *is* very tolerant of Henry VII's usurpation. I can't remember his saying anywhere, brutally, that Henry hadn't a vestige of a shadow of a claim to the throne.'

'Who put him there, then? Henry, I mean.'

'The Lancastrian remnant and the upstart Woodvilles, backed, I suppose, by a country revolted by the boys' murder. Apparently anyone with a spice of Lancastrian blood in their veins would do. Henry himself was canny enough to put "conquest" first in his claim to the throne, and his Lancaster blood second. "De jure belli et de jure Lancastriae." His mother was the heir of an illegitimate son of the third son of Edward III.'

'All I know about Henry VII is that he was fantastically rich and fantastically mean. Do you know the lovely Kipling story about his knighting the craftsman not for having done beautiful work but for having saved him the cost of some scroll-work?'

'With a rusty sword from behind the arras. You must be one of the few women who know their Kipling.'

'Oh, I'm a very remarkable woman in many ways. So you are no nearer finding out about Richard's personality than you were?'

'No. I'm as completely bewildered as Sir Cuthbert Oliphant, bless his heart. The only difference between us is that I know I'm bewildered and he doesn't seem to be aware of it.'

'Have you seen much of my woolly lamb?'

'I've seen nothing of him since his first visit, and that's three days ago. I'm beginning to wonder whether he has repented of his promise.'

'Oh, no. I'm sure not. Faithfulness is his banner and creed.'

'Like Richard.'

'Richard?'

'His motto was: "Loyaulté me lie". Loyalty binds me.'

There was a tentative tap at the door, and in answer to Grant's invitation, Brent Carradine appeared, hung around with topcoat as usual.

'Oh! I seem to be butting in. I didn't know you were here, Miss Hallard. I met the Statue of Liberty in the corridor there, and she seemed to think you were alone, Mr. Grant.'

Grant identified the Statue of Liberty without difficulty. Marta said that she was in the act of going, and that in any case Brent was a much more welcome visitor than she was nowadays. She would leave them in peace to pursue their search for the soul of a murderer.

When he had bowed her politely to the door Brent came back and sat himself down in the visitor's chair with exactly the same air that an Englishman wears when he sits down to his port after the women have left the table. Grant wondered if even the female-ridden American felt a subconscious relief at settling down to a stag party. In answer to Brent's inquiry as to how he was getting on with Oliphant, he said he found Sir Cuthbert admirably lucid.

'I've discovered who the Cat and the Rat were, incidentally. They were entirely respectable knights of the realm: William Catesby and Richard Ratcliffe. Catesby was Speaker of the House of Commons, and Ratcliffe was one of the Commissioners of Peace with Scotland. It's odd how the very sound of words makes a political jingle vicious. The Hog of course was Richard's badge. The White Boar. Do you frequent our English pubs?'

'Sure. They're one of the things I think you do better than us.'

'You forgive us our plumbing for the sake of the beer at the Boar.'

'I wouldn't go as far as to say I forgive it. I discount it, shall we say.'

'Magnanimous of you. Well, there's something else you've got to discount. That theory of yours that Richard hated his brother because of the contrast between his beauty and Richard's hunchbacked state. According to Sir Cuthbert, the hunchback is a myth. So is the withered arm. It appears that he had no visible deformity. At least none that mattered. His left shoulder was lower than his right, that was all. Did you find out who the contemporary historian is?'

'There isn't one.

'None at *all?*'

'Not in the sense that you mean it. There *were* writers who were contemporaries of Richard, but they wrote after his death. For the Tudors. Which puts them out of court. There is a monkish chronicle in Latin somewhere that is contemporary, but I haven't been able to get hold of it yet. One thing I have discovered though: that account of Richard III is called Sir Thomas More's not because he wrote it but because the manuscript was found among his papers. It was an unfinished copy of an account that appears elsewhere in finished form.'

'Well!' Grant considered this with interest. 'You mean it was More's own manuscript copy?'

'Yes. In his own writing. Made when he was about thirty-five. In those days, before printing was general, manuscript copies of books were the usual thing.'

'Yes. So, if the information came from John Morton, as it did, it is just as likely that the thing was written by Morton.'

'Yes.'

'Which would certainly account for the - the lack of sensibility. A climber like Morton wouldn't be at all abashed by back-stairs gossip. Do you know about Morton?'

'No.'

'He was a lawyer turned churchman, and the greatest pluralist on record. He chose the Lancastrian side and stayed with it until it was clear that Edward IV was home and dried. Then he made his peace with the York side and Edward made him Bishop of Ely. And vicar of God knows how many parishes besides. But after Richard's accession he backed first the Woodvilles and then Henry Tudor and ended up with a cardinal's hat as Henry VII's Archbishop of ——'

'Wait a minute!' said the boy, amused. 'Of *course* I know Morton. He was Morton of "Morton's Fork". You can't be spending much so how about something for the king; you're spending such a lot you must be very rich so how about something for the King"'

'Yes. That Morton. Henry's best thumb-screw. And I've just thought of a reason why he might have a personal hatred for Richard long before the murder of the boys.'

'Yes?'

'Edward took a large bribe from Louis XI to make a dishonourable peace in France. Richard was very angry about that - it really was a disgraceful affair - and washed his hands of the business. Which included refusing a large cash offer. But Morton was very much in favour both of the deal and the cash. Indeed he took a pension from Louis. A very nice pension it was. Two thousand crowns a year. I don't suppose Richard's outspoken comments went down very well, even with good gold for a chaser.'

'No. I guess not.'

'And of course there would be no preferment for Morton under the straight-laced Richard as there had been under the easy-going Edward. So he would have taken the Woodville side, even if there had been no murder.'

'About that murder-' the boy said; and paused.

'Yes?'

'About that murder - the murder of those two boys - isn't it odd that no one talks of it?'

'How do you mean: no one talks of it?'

'These last three days I've been going through contemporary papers: letters and what not. And no one mentions them at all.'

'Perhaps they were afraid to. It was a time when it paid to be discreet.'

'Yes; but I'll tell you something even odder. You know that Henry brought a Bill of Attainder against Richard, after Bosworth. Before Parliament, I mean. Well, he accuses Richard of cruelty and tyranny but doesn't even mention the murder.'

'What!' said Grant, startled.

'Yes, you may well look startled.'

'Are you sure!'

'Quite sure.'

'But Henry got possession of the Tower immediately on his arrival in London after Bosworth. If the boys were missing it is incredible that he should not publish the fact immediately. It was the trump card in his hand.' He lay in surprised silence for a little. The sparrows on the window-sill quarrelled loudly. 'I can't make sense of it,' he said. 'What possible explanation can there be for his omission to make capital out of the fact that the boys were missing?'

Brent shifted his long legs to a more comfortable position. 'There is only one explanation,' he said. 'And that is that the boys weren't missing.'

There was a still longer silence this time, while they stared at each other.

'Oh, no, it's nonsense,' Grant said. 'There must be some obvious explanation that we are failing to see.'

'As what, for instance?'

'I don't know. I haven't had time to think.'

'Ive had nearly three days to think, and I still haven't thought up a reason that will fit. *Nothing* will fit the facts except the conclusion that the boys were alive when Henry took over the Tower. It was a completely unscrupulous Act of Attainder; it accused Richard's followers - the loyal followers of an anointed King fighting against an invader - of treason. Every accusation that Henry could possibly make with any hope of getting away with it was put into that Bill. And the very worst he could accuse Richard of was the usual cruelty and tyranny. The boys aren't even mentioned.'

'It's fantastic.'

'It's unbelievable. But it is fact.'

'What it means is that there was *no contemporary accusation at all.*'

'That's about it.'

'But - but wait a minute. Tyrrel was *hanged* for the murder. He actually confessed to it before he died. Wait a minute.' He reached for Oliphant and sped through the pages looking for the place. 'There's a full account of it here somewhere. There was no mystery about it. Even the Statue of Liberty knew about it.'

'Who?'

'The nurse you met in the corridor. It was Tyrrel who committed the murder and he was found guilty and confessed before his death.'

'Was that when Henry took over in London, then?'

'Wait a moment. Here it is.' He skimmed down the paragraph. 'No, it was in 1502.' He realised all of a sudden what he had just said and repeated in a new bewildered tone: 'In - 1502.'

'But - but - but that was -'

'Yes. Nearly twenty years afterwards.'

Brent fumbled for his cigarette case, took it out, and then put it hastily away again.

'Smoke if you like,' Grant said. 'It's a good stiff drink I need. I don't think my brain can be working very well. I feel the way I used to feel as a child when I was blind-folded and whirled round before beginning a blind-~~man~~'s-buff game.'

'Yes,' said Carradine. He took out a cigarette and lighted it. 'Completely in the dark, and more than a little dizzy.'

He sat staring at the sparrows.

'Forty million school books can't be wrong,' Grant said after a little.

'Can't they?'

'Well, can they!'

'I used to think so, but I'm not so sure nowadays.'

'Aren't you being a little sudden in your scepticism?'

'Oh, it wasn't this that shook me.'

'What then?'

'A little affair called the Boston Massacre. Ever heard of it?'

'Of course.'

'Well, I discovered quite by accident, when I was looking up something at college, that the Boston Massacre consisted of a mob throwing stones at a sentry. The total casualties were four. I was brought up on the Boston Massacre, Mr. Grant. My twenty-eight inch chest used to swell at the very memory of it. My good red spinach-laden blood used to seethe at the thought of helpless civilians mowed down by the fire of British troops. You can't imagine what a shock it was to find that all it added up to in actual fact was a brawl that wouldn't get more than local reporting in a clash between police and strikers in any American lock-out.'

As Grant made no reply to this, he squinted his eyes against the light to see how Grant was taking it. But Grant was staring at the ceiling as if he were watching patterns forming there.

'That's partly why I like to research so much,' Carradine volunteered; and settled back to staring at the sparrows.

Presently Grant put his hand out, wordlessly, and Carradine gave him a cigarette and lighted it for him.

They smoked in silence.

It was Grant who interrupted the sparrows' performance.

'Tonypandy,' he said.

'How's that?'

But Grant was still far away.

'After all, I've seen the thing at work in my own day, haven't I,' he said, not to Carradine but to the ceiling. 'It's Tonypandy.'

'And what in heck is Tonypandy?' Brent asked. 'It sounds like a patent medicine. Does your child get out of sorts? Does the little face get flushed, the temper short, and the limbs easily tired? Give the little one Tonypandy, and see the radiant results.' And then, as Grant made no answer: 'All right, then; keep your Tonypandy. I wouldn't have it as a gift.'

'Tonypandy,' Grant said, still in that sleep-walking voice, 'is a place in the South of Wales.'

'I knew it was some kind of physic.'

'If you go to South Wales you will hear that in 1910, the Government used troops to shoot down Welsh miners who were striking for their rights. You'll probably hear that Winston Churchill, who was Home Secretary at the time, was responsible. South Wales, you will be told, will never forget Tonypandy!'

Carradine had dropped his flippant air.

'And it wasn't a bit like that?'

'The actual facts are these. The rougher section of the Rhondda valley crowd had got quite out of hand. Shops were being looted and property destroyed. The Chief Constable of Glamorgan sent a request to the Home Office for troops to protect the lieges. If a Chief Constable thinks a situation serious enough to ask for the help of the military a Home Secretary has very little choice in the matter. But Churchill was so horrified at the possibility of the troops coming face to face with a crowd of rioters and having to fire on them, that he stopped the movement of the troops and sent instead a body of plain, solid Metropolitan Police, armed with nothing but their rolled-up mackintoshes. The troops were kept in reserve, and all contact with the rioters was made by unarmed London police. The only bloodshed in the whole affair was a bloody nose or two. The Home Secretary was severely criticised in the House of Commons incidentally for his "unprecedented intervention". That was Tonypandy. That is the shooting-down by troops that Wales will never forget.

'Yes,' Carradine said, considering. 'Yes. It's almost a parallel to the Boston affair. Someone blowing up a simple affair to huge proportions for a political end.'

'The point is not that it is a parallel. The point is that *every single man* who was there knows that the story is nonsense, and yet it has never been contradicted. It will never be overtaken now. It is a completely untrue story grown to legend while the men who knew it to be untrue looked on and said nothing.'

'Yes. That's very interesting; very. History as it is made.'

'Yes. History.'

'Give me research. After all, the truth of anything at all doesn't lie in someone's account of it. It lies in all the small facts of the time. An advertisement in a paper. The sale of a house. The price of a ring.'

Grant went on looking at the ceiling, and the sparrows' clamour came back into the room.

'What amuses you?' Grant said, turning his head at last and catching the expression on his visitor's face.

'This is the first time I've seen you look like a policeman.'

'I'm feeling like a policeman. I'm *thinking* like a policeman. I'm asking myself the question that every policeman askes in every case of murder: Who benefits? And for the first time it occurs to me that the glib theory that Richard got rid of the boys to make himself safer on the throne is so much nonsense. Supposing he had got rid of the boys. There were still the boys' five sisters between him and the throne. To say nothing of George's two: the boy and girl. George's son and daughter were barred by their father's attainder; but I take it that an attainder can be reversed, or annulled, or something. If Richard's claim was shaky, all those lives stood between him and safety.'

'And did they all survive him?'

'I don't know. But I shall make it my business to find out. The boys' eldest sister certainly did because she became Queen of England as Henry's wife.'

'Look, Mr. Grant, let's you and I start at the very beginning of this thing. Without history books, or modern versions, or anyone's opinion about anything. Truth isn't in accounts but in account books.'

'A neat phrase,' Grant said complimentary. 'Does it mean anything?'

'It means everything. The real history is written in forms not meant as history. In Wardrobe accounts, in Privy Purse expenses, in personal letters, in estate books. If someone, say, insists that Lady Whoosit never had a child, and you find in the account book the entry: "For the son born to my lady on Michaelmas eve: five yards of blue ribbon, fourpence halfpenny" it's a reasonably fair deduction that my lady had a son on Michaelmas eve.'

'Yes. I see. All right, where do we begin?'

'You're the investigator. I'm only the looker-upper.'

'Research Worker.'

'Thanks. What do you want to know?'

'Well, for a start, it would be useful, not to say enlightening, to know how the principals in the case reacted to Edward's death. Edward IV, I mean. Edward died unexpectedly, and his death must have caught everyone on the hop. I'd like to know how the people concerned reacted.

'That's straightforward and easy. I take it you mean what they did and not what they thought.'

'Yes, of course.'

'Only historians tell you what they thought. Research workers stick to what they did.'

'What they did is all I want to know. I've always been a believer in the old saw that actions speak louder than words.'

'Incidentally, what does the sainted Sir Thomas say that Richard did when he heard that his brother was dead?' Brent wanted to know.

'The sainted Sir Thomas (alias John Mortion) says that Richard got busy being charming to the Queen and persuading her not to send a large bodyguard to escort the boy prince from Ludlow; meanwhile cooking up a plot to kidnap the boy on his way to London.'

'According to the sainted More, then, Richard meant from the very first to supplant the boy.'

'Oh, yes.'

'Well, we shall find out, at least, who was where and doing what, whether we can deduce their intentions or not.'

'That's what I want. Exactly.'

'Policeman!' jibed the boy. '"Where were you at five p.m. on the night of the fifteenth inst?"'

'It works,' Grant assured him. 'It works.'

'Well, I'll go away and work too. I'll be in again as soon as I have got the information you want. I'm very grateful to you, Mr. Grant. This is a lot better than the Peasants.'

He floated away into the gathering dusk of the winter afternoon, his train-like coat giving an academic sweep and dignity to his thin young figure.

Grant switched on his lamp, and examined the pattern it made on the ceiling as if he had never seen it before.

It was a unique and engaging problem that the boy had dropped so casually into his lap. As unexpected as it was baffling.

What possible reason could there be for that lack of contemporary accusation?

Henry had not even needed proof that Richard was himself responsible. The boys were in Richard's care. If they were not to be found when the Tower was taken over, then that was far finer, thicker mud to throw at his dead rival than the routine accusations of cruelty and tyranny.

From Tey, Josephine, The Daughter of Time, London: Davies, 1951.

APPENDIX C

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF LIBRARY SOURCES FOR IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN

Teaching the Case Study: An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Sources

Research Sources on the Problem:

*Armstrong, C.A.J. The Usurpation of Richard III, (2nd ed.) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969 (first edition, 1936). A very useful primary source of information, this book is a translation of an Italian visitor's account of the English Court as it appeared in 1482 and 1483. The introduction by the translator also provides the reader with some insights into the reliability of the observations reported by this observer.

Cheetham, Anthony. The Life and Times of Richard III, London: Weindenfield and Nicolson, 1972. A brief and colourfully illustrated book describing Richard's England. Also contains a useful summary of research on Richard III's guilt in the murder of the princes.

Collis, Louise. "The Murder of the Princes" In Seven In The Tower, London: Faber, 1958. An account of the events leading up to the murder of the princes in the Tower. The author generally accepts Sir Thomas More's argument which places the blame on Richard III.

*Continuator of the Chronicle of the Abbey of Croyland, In Littleton and Rea (Eds.), To Prove a Villain, New York: Macmillan, 1965. This is a chronicle written in 1486 by a monk at the Abbey of Croyland. It is a very useful primary source on the rule of Richard.

*Gairdner, James. History of the Life and Reign of Richard III, New York: Greenwood Press, 1969 (first published, 1898). This is one of the most complete treatments of the standard case against Richard III, which condemns him for the murder of the princes.

Kendall, Paul Murray. Richard the Third, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1955. The standard work on the life of Richard III. A very well researched book which contains an excellent appendix dealing with the problem of the murder of the princes.

Kendall, Paul Murray. Richard the Third: The Great Debate, New York: W.W. Norton, 1965. A good review and analysis of the evidence both for and against Richard III in the case of the princes in the Tower.

Lamb, V.B. The Betrayal of Richard III, London: Coram, 1959. This book traces the growth of the traditional accusations against Richard as the murderer of the princes in the Tower. It is highly critical of this evidence.

Langdon-Davies, John. Richard III and the Princes in the Tower, London: Jonathan Cape Jackdaw Series, 1965. This is a large folder containing both primary and secondary source material on Richard's responsibility for the murder of the princes. Materials include; photographs of the Tower and the prince's skeletons, as well as articles dealing with the historical background of the period and the primary source material on the topic.

*Markham, Sir Clements R. Richard III: His Life and Character Reviewed in the Light of Recent Research, New York: Russell and Russell, 1968 (first published, 1906). Markham regards Richard as being one of England's great kings and, therefore, opposes the views of those that would accuse him of the crime against the princes. He systematically dismantles the evidence of More, Mancini, Polydore Vergil, as well as later secondary sources.

*More, Sir Thomas. "The History of King Richard the Thirde" In The Complete Works of St. Thomas More, Vol. 2, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963. This is the most recent edition of a work, central to the historic case against Richard, written first in 1513. Rather difficult for modern readers, because it is written in the language of the time.

Myers, A.R. "The Character of Richard the Third" In History Today, 1954, iv. A clearly written article which summarizes many of the important articles and books on the subject. Concludes with an interesting study of the case against Richard in the Tower.

*Polydore Vergil. "English History" In Littleton and Rea (eds.), To Prove A Villain, New York: Macmillan, 1965. The excerpt of Henry VII's official historian's account of the reign of Richard III. A useful contemporary source.

*Walpole, Horace. "Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard the Third" In Littleton and Rea (Eds.), To Prove a Villain, New York: Macmillan, 1965. One of the earliest criticisms (1769) of Sir Thomas More's evidence which condemns Richard III of the murder of the princes in the Tower.

Williamson, Hugh Ross. "Who Murdered the Princes in the Tower?" In Historical Whodunits, London: Michael Joseph, 1954. A summary of the mystery which surrounds the deaths of the two young princes in the Tower.

Sources on the Historical Background of the Problem:

***Alderman, Clifford Lindsey. Blood Red the Roses, New York: Julian Messner, 1971. A simply written account of the causes and conduct of the Wars of the Roses. This book has a good discussion in one chapter on the murder of the princes.

Beatty, Jerome. "Tradewinds" In Saturday Review, April 13, 1968 51. An entertaining account of a talk given by A.L. Rowse, a firm supporter of the Tudor tradition, to the American Branch of the Richard III Society in New York.

Bennett, H.S. The Pastons and Their England, London: Frederick Muller, 1958 (first published, 1922). Tells the story of the daily life of an English gentry family through information gathered from their letters.

*Kendall, Paul Murray. The Yorkist Age: Daily Life During the Wars of the Roses, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1962. An excellent reference book on the spirit of the times of Edward IV's and Richard III's reigns. Gives many insights into the business, family and social life of late Fifteenth century England.

**Makinson, Albert. "The Road to Bosworth Field" In History Today, 1963, iv. Describes, in some detail, the preparations for the Battle of Bosworth made by Henry Tudor and Richard III.

**Makinson, Albert. "The Wars of the Roses: Who Fought and Why?" In History Today, 1959, ix. An analysis of the major causes and events of the Wars of the Roses. Major theme of the article concerns the relationships between the wars fought by the nobility and the general lawlessness in the country.

Historical Fiction:

Farrington, Robert. The Killing of Richard the Third, London: Chatto and Windus, 1971. The reign of Richard III as seen through the eyes of one Henry Morane, an imaginary clerk in the service of the king.

Jarman, Rosemary Hawley. We Speak No Treason, London: Collins, 1971. A historical novel about the private personality of Richard the man, rather than Richard the king.

Tey, Josephine. The Daughter of Time, London: Peter Davies, 1951. A novel about a modern detective reopening the case of Richard and the murder of the princes in the Tower. Opens up many questions in a still unsolved crime.

* More difficult reading, suggested for teacher reference and better student readers.

** Difficult reading, suggested for teacher reference only.

*** Suggested for those having difficulty reading the recommended books on this list.

APPENDIX D

RESULTS OF FLESCH READABILITY TESTS ON TWO ARTICLES REQUIRED FOR STUDENT READING

Results of Flesch Readability Test on "England During the Wars of the Roses"

Because of the brevity of this article a reading difficulty assessment was done on the entire piece. The results of the assessment are as follows:

length of the article: 608 words

average sentence length: 22 words

24 affixes in 100 words

15 personal references in 100 words

reading grade placement: 7.8

Results of Flesch Readability Test on "A Policeman Looks at the Murder of the Princes"

A reading difficulty assessment was made on four approximately one hundred word sample passages in this article. Following Flesch's (1943, p. 57) recommendation these samples were selected beginning with the first complete paragraph on every third page.

Passage I (page 1)

101 words

average sentence: 9 words

14 affixes in 100 words

20 personal references in 100 words

reading grade placement: 4.7

Passage II (page 4)

103 words

average sentence: 21 words

24 affixes in 100 words

19 personal references in 100 words

reading grade placement: 7.3

Passage III (page 7)

93 words

average sentence length: 10 words

24 affixes in 100 words

13 personal references in 100 words

reading grade placement: 6.1

Passage IV

99 words

average sentence length: 7 words

23 affixes in 100 words

4 personal references in 100 words

reading grade placement: 6.4